OF THE SACRAMENTS IN GENERAL,

In Pursuance of an

EXPLICATION OF THE CATECHISM OF THE *CHURCH* of *ENGLAND*.

BY

GABRIEL TOWERSON, D.D.

and Rector of *Welwynne* in *Hartfordshire*.

LONDON,

Printed for Richard Chiswell, at the *Rose* and *Crown* in St. *Paul*'s Church-yard. M DC LXXXVI.

TO THE
Right Reverend
FATHER in GOD
FRANCIS
Lord Biſhop of *ELY*,
AND
LORD ALMONER
TO
His Majeſty.

My Lord,

THough I am almoſt aſhamed to make my Addreſs to your Lordſhip with ſo ſmall a Treatiſe as this, yet having no more of it finiſhed, and this little being the Foundation of the reſt, I hope

your Lordſhip will accept of it as ſome acknowledgement of thoſe great Condeſcentions with which your Lordſhip hath been pleas'd to honour ſo mean a Perſon as my ſelf.

I might indeed, if I had conceived it better ſo to do, have kept it by me, till it had grown more complete, and ſo have made it a more ſuitable Preſent to a Perſon of your Lordſhip's Character in the Church and in the Court: But I conſidered that what I now humbly offer to your Lordſhip and the Publick, muſt

muſt be my Meaſure in the following Tracts, and ſo may need the advice of others as well as my own thoughts to perfect it, and I may gain this advantage by the ſeparate Edition of it, to know from ſome of my Friends what in it is weak or imperfect: In which if your Lordſhip will further vouchſafe your admonition, it will make what remains the more fit to be preſented to your Lordſhip, by

Your Moſt Obliged,

Welwynne, Nov. 26. 1685.

Moſt Obedient, and

Moſt humble Servant,

Gabriel Towerſon.

The Contents of the First Part.

Of the Signification of the Word SACRAMENT.

THE Word Sacrament, *in the* primitive notion *of it, the name of the* Military Oath, *as well that, which came to be afterwards impos'd, as that which was at first voluntarily taken by the Souldiers. Which denomination it had both from the ſacredneſs of an Oath in its own Nature, and from thoſe Sacred Ceremonies, wherewith that, and other Oaths were attended. The Word* Sacrament, *in the* Chriſtian *ſenſe of it, tranſlated from thence into the Church, and applied to thoſe Inſtitutions of it, which now go under that name. As is made*

made appear from the footing the former ſignification had gotten in the World; From the Scriptures, and the Ancient Chriſtians repreſenting the Life and Inſtitution of a Chriſtian under the notion of a Military *one; And, in fine, from the ſame Antients making uſe of that* Word *in the Military ſenſe. Evidence of this laſt from general applications of it, and an account given thereupon of the particular inſtances, which they gave of the likeneſs of the* Chriſtian *Sacrament to the purely* Military *one.* pag. 1.

The Contents of the ſecond Part.

Of the Nature of a SACRAMENT.

A *Sacrament ſhewn to be a* Relative *thing, more particularly ſuch a Relative thing, as hath the relation of an* outward, and viſible ſign *of that, of which it is a Sacrament. That therefore aſſign'd as the* Genus *of a Sacrament, and enquiry thereupon made after thoſe* eſſential attributes, *which difference it from other*

outward

outward and visible signs. Which is endeavour'd to be evinc'd from the several things to which a Sacrament relates, the manner *of its relation to each of them, and the* foundation *of that relation. The* things, *to which a Sacrament relates, shewn in the general to be Sacred, or Divine, more particularly, divine Graces, and humane Duties, that New Covenant, which connects them together, and that body of men, which is confederated by it. To the first of which a Sacrament relates in the* nature *of a sign, a means of conveyance, and a pledge; To the second in the* nature *of a simple sign, or declaration, and (by means of that Covenant, which it conciliates) as an Obligation to them; To the third in the* nature *of such a sign, as serves also to give being to, or renew it; And to the fourth, and last in the* nature *of a Discriminative sign, or badge, and as a means of bringing particular men into it, or continuing them in it. The* foundation *of all these relations shewn to be the* Institution *of Christ, as that again, not so much as delivered by him, as applied to those elements, in*

which they are ſubjected, by a declaration of the purport of the Inſtitution, and by doing ſuch other things to them, as either the general precepts of Chriſtianity, or the more particular precepts of the inſtitution oblige to the performance of. A brief recollection made of all the forementioned particulars, and the eſſential attributes of a Sacrament deduced from thence, and exemplified in ſeveral definitions of it. pag. 25.

The Contents of the Third Part.

A farther Explication of the Nature of a Sacrament, with a reſolution of ſeveral Queſtions belonging thereunto, or depending more immediately upon it.

THE Nature of a Sacrament brought again under conſideration, and enquiry accordingly made concerning that inward and Spiritual Grace, *to which it relates, the* manner *of its* relation *to it, and the* foundation *of that relation. This laſt more particularly inſiſted upon, and as it was before reſolv'd to be the* Inſtitution of Chriſt,

Christ, *so a more ample account given thereupon of that Institution of his, and of those* Commands, *and* Promises, *whereof it doth consist. Those* Commands *again considered with reference to the sacramental* Elements, *before they put on that relation, or after they are invested with it. The* former *whereof are shewn in the general to enjoyn the* setting them apart *for that purpose, or* Consecrating *them, and enquiry thereupon made* by whom *they ought to be set apart, and whether their* intention, *or* good disposition *be requisite to give force unto it: The latter the Consecrators dispensing them as the Institutor thereof hath prescrib'd, and the peoples receiving them from them, with the Manner of it. Upon occasion whereof Enquiry is made, concerning the necessity of Sacraments, and in what sort, or degree they ought to be accounted such. A like particular account given of the* Promises *of the Institution, which are shewn in* the general *to assure Christ's making what is done both by the Consecrators, and Receivers to be available for those ends, for which they were enjoyn'd;*

More particularly *his converting that into a Sacrament, which is by the former ſet apart to be ſo (and which how it is done is, upon that account, enquir'd into) and, where the Receivers are rightly diſpos'd, acompanying the diſpenſation of the Sacramental Elements with the Diſpenſation of the Divine Graces. An application of the whole to the buſineſs in hand, and Enquiry accordingly made, how the former* Commands, *and* Promiſes *contribute toward the* Founding *a Sacramental* Relation, *and how alſo to the efficacy of the elements, after that Relation is produced in them.* pag. 95.

The Contents of the fourth Part.

Of the *Jewiſh* Sacraments, and the *Number* of the Chriſtian.

THE Doctrine of the Sacraments *drawn down to* particulars, *and enquiry firſt made concerning the* Jewiſh Sacraments, *and then concerning the* Chriſtian *ones. As to the* former *whereof is ſhewn* firſt, *that there were indeed* ſuch *Sacraments among*

mong them, and evidence made there-of, from their enjoying the ſame Saving Graces, *which our Sacra-ments pretend to convey, from their being furniſhed alike with* External Symbols *to convey them, and thoſe* Symbols *of God, and Chriſt's inſti-tution:* Secondly, *that thoſe Sacra-ments of theirs were either the* extraordinary *ones they had in their paſ-ſage from* Ægypt *to* Canaan, *as their* Baptiſm *in the Cloud, and in the Sea, and the* Eucharist *of Manna, and the Water of the Rock, or the* ordinary *ones of* Circumciſion, *and the* Paſsover; Thirdly, *That, though they were of the ſame general nature with the* Chriſtian, *yet they differ'd from them, both as to the* manner *of their repreſenting the Divine Graces, which was not ſo* clear, *and as to the* meaſure *of conveyance of them, which was not ſo* full, *as in the* Chriſtian *Sacraments. Thoſe* Chriſtian *Sacra-ments, in the next place, brought un-der conſideration, and evidence made of* Baptiſm, *and the Lord's Supper being the only* true, *and* proper *ones, or of* general neceſſity *to Salvation.*

p. 131.
Errata.

ERRATA.

In the Text.

PAg. 23. l. antep. r. *tended*. p. 80. l. 2. r. *to it*. p. 109. l. 9. for *under* r. *on*. p. 156. l. 11. r. *As appears*. p. 157. l. 11. *thy antient*. p. 168. l. antep. for *with* r. *in*

In the Margent.

Pag. 5. l. 8. *dimisit*. p. 7. l. 3. *præcedes*. p. 48. l. 10. *li.* 5. p. 153. l. 3. *cap.* 3. p. 165. l. 3. 2 *Tim.* 1. 6.

OF

OF THE SACRAMENTS IN GENERAL.

PART I.

Of the Signification of the Word SACRAMENT.

The Contents.

The Word Sacrament, *in the* primitive notion *of it, the name of the* Military Oath, *as well that, which came to be afterwards impos'd, as that which was at first voluntarily taken by the Souldiers. Which denomination it had both from the ſacredneſs of an Oath in its own Na-*

ture, and from thoſe Sacred Ceremonies, wherewith that, and other Oaths were attended. The Word Sacrament, *in the* Chriſtian *ſenſe, of it, tranſlated from thence into the Church, and applied to thoſe Inſtitutions of it, which now go under that name. As is made appear from the footing the former ſignification had gotten in the World; From the Scriptures, and the Ancient Chriſtians repreſenting the Life and Inſtitution of a Chriſtian under the notion of a* Military *one; And, in fine, from the ſame Antient's making uſe of that* Word *in the Military ſenſe. Evidence of this laſt from general applications of it, and an account given thereupon of the particular inſtances, which they gave of the likeneſs of the* Chriſtian *Sacrament to the purely* Military *one.*

Queſtion. How many Sacraments hath Chriſt ordained in his Church?

IF it ſhall pleaſe that God, by whom I have been carried on thus far, to continue to me the ſame Health, and Leiſure, and Aſſiſtances, which I have met with in compoſing the *three* foregoing parts

parts of this *Explication*, I will endeavour to inform my ſelf, and then others concerning the *Sacraments* of our Religion, more particularly concerning thoſe *two*, which (in the opinion of our Church) are the only either *proper* (*a*), or *generally neceſſary* (*b*) ones. Thoſe, as they are the Argument of the *fourth* and *laſt* Part of our Churches Catechiſm; ſo being accordingly to be the matter of this *fourth* and *laſt Part* of my *Explication* of it,

I will begin, for that purpoſe, with the *ſignification* of the word Sacrament, and which, though it will not clear up to us the full Nature of the things intended by it, yet will ſerve to diſcover to us a conſiderable part thereof, and help toward the finding out of the other. Now the word *Sacrament*, in the *Antient* intendment of it, ſignified an *Oath*, and particularly that *Oath*, which *Souldiers took* to be faithful to their Generals, and to do all thoſe other things which the duty of their place, or the Diſcipline of War required of them: With this only difference in point of time (which is wont either

Anſwer. Two only, as generally neceſſary to Salvation, that is to ſay, Baptiſm and the Supper of the Lord.

(*a*) Art. of Rel. 25.

(*b*) Catech. ubi ſupra.

to contract, or enlarge the ſignification of words) that as that Oath was at firſt *voluntarily* taken by the Souldiers, ſo the word *Sacrament* was ſome time ſet to denote ſuch *voluntary* ones in contradiſtinction to thoſe, which were afterwards *impos'd*. We have an illuſtrious proof of all this in a paſſage of *Livy**, which therefore I ſhall here ſubjoyn. *Then firſt* (even in the Conſulſhip of *L. Æmilius Paulus*, and *Terentius Varro*) *were the Souldiers oblig'd by their Tribunes under an Oath to meet together at the command of their Conſuls, and not to depart without their leave. For till that time there had been nothing but a Sacrament, and when they were met together by Tens, or by Hundreds, the Horſemen, who met by Tens, and the Footmen, who met by Hundreds, did, of their own proper motion, take an Oath among themſelves, that they would not depart out of fear, or cowardice, nor quit their ranks at any time, unleſs it*

* Hiſt. lib. 22. *Milites tunc, quod nunquam antea factum erat, jurejurando à Tribunis militum adacti, juſſu Conſulum conventuros, neque injuſſu abituros. Nam ad eam diem nil præter Sacramentum fuerat, & ubi ad decuriatum, aut centuriatum conveniſſent, ſuâ voluntate ipſi inter ſe equites decuriati, centuriati pedites conjurabant, ſeſe fugæ, atque formidinis ergo, non abituros, neque ex ordine receſſuros, niſi teli ſumendi, aut petendi, aut hoſtis feriendi, aut civis ſervandi cauſâ. Id ex voluntario inter ipſos fœdere ad legitimam jurisjurandi adactionem tranſlatum.*

it were to take up their Weapon, to dart at, or ſtrike the Enemy, or to ſave a Citizen. But that which proceeded at firſt from a voluntary Covenant among themſelves, was by the Tribunes altered into a preſcribed, and impoſed Oath, and the Souldiers forc'd to take it from them. Where we have not only the word *Sacrament* ſet to denote a *Souldier's Oath,* but *ſuch* an *Oath,* as was *voluntarily* taken by them, and had rather their own free conſent, than the Command of their General to give being to it. But as we find by the ſame paſſage, that what was at firſt but voluntary, came afterwards to be impoſed upon the Souldiers; ſo we find alſo that the word *Sacrament* came afterwards to ſignifie thoſe *impoſed* Oaths, as well as the former *voluntary* ones. For thus it is plain, *Cicero* † uſed it in the account he gives of *Cato*'s writing to *Popillius* a General of the

† De Officiis li. 1. *M. Popillius Imperator tenebat provinciam, in cujus exercitu Catonis filius tiro militabat. Quum autem Popillio videretur unam dimittere legionem, Catonis quoque filium, qui in eadem legione militabat, demiſit. Sed quum amore pugnandi in exercitu remanſiſſet, Cato ad Popillium ſcripſit, ut ſi eum pateretur in exercitu remanere, ſecundo eum obligaret Militiæ Sacramento, quia, priore amiſſo, jure pugnare cum hoſtibus non poterat.*

Romans, to liſt his Son anew, if he thought good to continue him in his Army; His words, as *Tully* recites them, being, that *if Popillius*, who had before diſmiſs'd the Legion, wherein he ſerv'd, *thought good to ſuffer young* Cato *to abide in his Army, he ſhould oblige*, or bind him *by a ſecond military Sacrament, becauſe the former being made void, he could not lawfully fight with the Enemy.* Which paſſage plainly imports the military Sacrament to be of the Generals Impoſing, yea ſo neceſſarily, that had not the General, in whom the right of making War was, given it to young *Cato*, he could not, in the opinion of his Father have ſtruck a ſtroke againſt the Enemy. Thus the uſe of the word *Sacrament* ſtood in the days immediately preceding our Saviour; And as the thing intended by it, even the Military Oath, was continued in the ſucceeding Ages, as is manifeſt from the frequent mention there is in *Suetonius* (*a*), and others of the Souldiers ſwearing to their Generals, ſo it continu'd to be repreſented under the title of a *Sacrament*, even to late poſterity. As appears,

(*a*) Suet. in Claud. c. 9. in Othone c. 8. & alibi paſſim.

appears, among other things, from *Horace*'s telling † his *Mecænas*, that *he had not taken a perfidious Sacrament*, because (as it there follows) *he was resolv'd to follow him, where ever he led*, which we know * to have been a great part of a Souldiers Oath: From *Juvenal*'s describing *Souldiers* † themselves under the title of *Sacramenta*; As in fine from the *Antients* describing Souldiers either departing, or being freed from their former service, by a departure, or freedom from their *Sacrament*. Of which beside other proofs (*d*), we have a Law of *Theodosius*, and *Honorius*, and which as it is under the title *de Veteranis*, or such as, by reason of their being superannuated, were dismiss'd from their former service, so expresseth the same *Veteranes* under the title of those who have ceased * to be *entangled by their former Sacraments*. Other instances I doubt not might be produced, if these were not enough;

† ---------- *non ego perfidum Dixi Sacramentum, ibimus, ibimus Utcunque præcedes.* Carm. li. 2. Od. 17.

* Dionys. Halicarnass. l. 11. Ὁ γὰρ ὅρκος ὁ στρατιωτικὸς, ὃν ἁπάντων μάλιστα ἐμπέδῳ Ῥωμαῖοι τοῖς στρατηγοῖς, ἀκολουθεῖν κελεύει τοὺς στρατευομένους ὅποι ποτ' ἂν ἄγωσι

† *Præmia nunc alia, atque alia emolumenta notemus Sacramentorum*---- Sat. 16.

(*d*) Ammianus Marcellinus li. 24. *Residuos duos tribunos Sacramento solvit, ut desides, & ignavos.* Idem li. 26. *Et Serenianus, olim Sacramento digressus, recinctus est.*

* Cod. li. 12. tit. 47. l. 4. *Nullus eorum qui Sacramentis inhærere desierit*, &c.

enough, to ſhew the word *Sacrament* to have had for its moſt uſual ſenſe that of a military Oath. But I ſhall only add, that though it were ſet to denote alſo *a piece of money left by each of the Litigants* (e) *in Court*; Yet as that was in a thing leſs known, than the Oaths of Souldiers were, and ſo the leſs likely to have any influence upon the framing of that mode of Speech, which was afterwards ſo much in uſe among the Chriſtians; ſo it had this in common with the Military Sacrament, that it was an *Obligation* upon the parties, that depoſited it, to proſecute that ſuit which they had commenced.

(e) Varro de lingua Lat.

But becauſe whatever the uſual ſenſe of the word *Sacrament* might antiently be, yet it is certain that it did not receive that ſenſe from the *literal* notation of it, but rather from ſomething of *Sacredneſs*, wherewith thoſe Oaths were attended: And becauſe the diſcovery of that *Sacredneſs* may help yet more to diſcover the true nature of thoſe *Sacraments* of ours, to which that name is now applied; therefore enquire we in the next place what there was in them of

Sacred

Sacred to occaſion that denomination of them. Now as *Sacred* is nothing elſe than what tends to the honour of God, whether in its own nature, or by inſtitution; ſo there were two things of that quality in thoſe Oaths, whereof we ſpeak, and from whence therefore they may be ſuppos'd to have receiv'd that denomination. Firſt their being in themſelves an acknowledgment of Gods glorious Attributes, and particularly of his Knowledge, Truth, Juſtice, and Power; He who appeals to God as a Witneſs, and a Judge (as every man, that ſweareth doth) implying his believing him to be a competent witneſs, and ſo both Knowing, and True, and one too, who both can, and will aſſert the cauſe of truth in the puniſhment of the party ſwearing, if he ſwear any other, than what he intends, or means. And in this ſenſe as it was that *Cicero* * entitled an Oath a *Religious Affirmation*, becauſe an Affirmation under the teſtimony of God; ſo I no way doubt it was in a great meaſure, that Oaths came to have the name of *Sacraments*, and particularly all Military

* De Offic. l. 3. *Eſt enim juſjurandum Affirmatio religioſa. Quod autem affirmatè, quaſi Deo teſte, promiſeris, id tenendum eſt.*

tary ones. But beſides that Sacredneſs which is intrinſecal to all Oaths, and therefore alſo to thoſe, whereof we are now diſcourſing; They had a further ſacredneſs from thoſe religious *Rites*, wherewith they were attended, and which under the veil of ſenſible things, and ſuch as were ſometime contemptible enough, were intended to inſinuate more valuable, and ſpiritual ones. Of this nature among the *Romans* was their laying their hands † upon the Altars of their Gods, or, which was yet more ſacred than that, their taking a Stone * into their hand, and then throwing it from them, withall praying, that if they falſified in the Oath they then took, *Jupiter* would throw them out of all, as they themſelves did that Stone from them: By the former whereof they deſign'd to expreſs the reverence they themſelves bare even to things dedicated to them, as well as a belief of their Gods taking care to preſerve them from all pollution; By the latter the quick apprehenſion they had of the power of their Gods over them, and particularly as to the ſpoiling them of their fortunes. And though

† *Falſus erit teſtis, vendet perjuria ſummâ Exiguâ, Cereris tangens aramq; pedemq;* Juv. Sat. 14.

* Feſtus. *Lapidem ſilicem tenebant, juraturi per Jovem, hæc verba dicentes; Si ſciens fallo, tum me Dieſpiter, ſalvâ urbe, arceque, bonis ejiciat, uti ego hunc lapidem.*

though I am not able to ſay, what were the particular rites of the Military Oath, at leaſt among the Antient Romans; yet as there is reaſon enough to believe, that ſo ſignal an Oath was not without them, and which was upon the matter the foundation of all the Roman greatneſs, ſo there is this farther reaſon to believe it, that the Antients (*f*) made uſe of the word *Sacramentum* to expreſs the Greek μυςήριον, and which as we know to have had a peculiar reference to thoſe Rites, and Ceremonies, which were in uſe in the ſervice of the Gods, ſo muſt conſequently imply the like ſenſe of that word, which was made uſe of to expreſs it, and the like ceremoniouſneſs of theſe Military Oaths, upon which it was impos'd. I may not forget to add, though appli'd by ſome (*g*) to another ſenſe, that *Herodian* * brings in the Emperor *Maximus* repreſenting *the Military Oath as the Venerable myſterie of the Roman Empire*. For

(*f*) *Vulgat. Lat. in Eph.* 5. 32. *& alibi.* Tertull. de Animâ *c.* 20. *ubi recitat d. l. ad Epheſios.*

(*g*) Iſ. Caſaub. *Exercit.* 16. *c.* 43.

* ὅσον μὲν ἡμᾶς ὤνησε μεταγνώντάς τε, καὶ τὰ Ῥωμαίων φρονήσαντας, πείρᾳ μεμαθήκατε, ἀντὶ πολέμου μὲν εἰρήνην ἔχοντες πρὸς θεοὺς οὓς ὀμωμόκατε, καὶ νῦν φυλάσσοντες τὸ στρατιωτικὸν ὅρκον, ὅς ἐστι τῆς Ῥωμαίων ἀρχῆς σεμνὸν μυςήριον. Herod. l. 8.

as

as that is a farther evidence, that that Oath was not without its Sacred Rites, becauſe *myſteries* properly ſo called were no other, than ſuch; ſo I know nothing to take off the force of it, but a preſumption of the word's μυστήριον admitting a lower ſenſe, and accordingly denoting no more than an *Arcanum*, or *Secret* of the Roman State, and by which the Founders thereof cunningly rais'd it to that greatneſs, to which it afterwards arriv'd. But how ill that notion agrees with the intention of him, who ſo entitled the Military Oath, will need no other proof than his prompting the Souldiers in the words before to look upon the Gods, by whom they had ſworn, as the Authors of their preſent peace. For what was this but to intimate, that it was the religious obſervation of their Oaths, which was the cauſe of their proſperity, and conſequently, that if thoſe Oaths were alſo the foundation, and prop of the Roman greatneſs, it was not ſo much by the *politick* impoſition of them, as by the ſacredneſs thereof, and by the religious obſervation of which the Gods were

were induc'd to bleſs them with that ample dominion, which they had attain'd? In this ſenſe yet more agreeably to the receiv'd opinion † of the *Romans*, becauſe attributing their ſucceſs, not ſo much to their own Wit, and Valour as to their religious veneration of the Gods, and thoſe Gods as having a favourable regard to them becauſe of it. If they look'd upon the *Military Sacrament*, and the Souldiers religious obſervation of it as contributing more eſpecially to the advancing of their greatneſs, it is the leſs to be wondred at, becauſe it was more immediately by the Arms of their Souldiers, that the Romans became maſters of the World. The reſult of the premiſes is this; The word *Sacrament*, in its *Original* intendment, had the ſignification of a *Military Oath*, it had the ſignification of *ſuch* a Military Oath, as was attended with *Sacred Rites*, and ſuch as led men by ſenſible reſemblances to things of a higher

† Cicero Orat. de Haruſp. Reſp. *---Etenim quis eſt tam vecors, qui aut, cum ſuſpexerit in cœlum, deos eſſe non ſentiat, &c. Aut, cum deos eſſe intellexerit, non intelligat eorum numine hoc totum Imperium eſſe natum, & auctum, & retentum? Quàm volumus licet P. C. ipſi nos amemus, tamen nec numero Hiſpanos, nec robore Gallos, nec calliditate Pœnos, nec artibus Græcos, nec denique hoc ipſo ejus gentis, ac terræ domeſtico, nativoque ſenſu Italos ipſos, ac Latinos, ſed pietate, ac religione, &c. omnes gentes, nationeſque ſuperavimus.*

higher nature. But whether or no, and how far it is to be look'd upon as of the like ſignification, in the *Chriſtian* intendment of it, doth not as yet appear, but will be worth our labour to enquire.

Now that the word *Sacrament*, in the *Chriſtian* intendment of it, is to be look'd upon as of like ſignification to what it had before acquir'd, will appear if we conſider *firſt*, what footing the former ſignification had gotten in the minds of men, before there was any appearance of the latter. For as conſidering the footing the former ſignification had gotten, we cannot but think that it would be apt to ſuggeſt it ſelf, as oft as the word *Sacrament* was made uſe of; ſo neither therefore but that it would form a like conceit of the Chriſtian Sacraments, and conſequently, if that were ſuch, an erroneous one. Which it being not to be thought, that they would give occaſion to, who firſt appli'd the word to the *Chriſtian* Sacraments; eſpecially when they might have had other words to expreſs their conception of them: It is but reaſonable to think that they made

made uſe of it upon occaſion of ſome likeneſs between the one and the other Sacraments, and conſequently that they intended it a like ſignification with the other. I deny not indeed (which is the anſwer Mr. *Calvin (h)* makes to this Argument in another inſtance) I deny not, I ſay, but that religion may, and doth very often ſtrangely alter words from their priſtin ſignification; I deny not farther (which is the inſtance he aſſigns) that the word *fides*, in the Chriſtian uſe of it, is both a very apt, and pregnant proof of ſuch a change. But as it doth not appear to me, that Religion did ever (unleſs in a long tract of time) ſo alter the known ſignification of words, as not to make them bear ſome analogy to the former ſignification of them; ſo the *Word*, in which that Learned man inſtanceth, is not ſo transform'd by Chriſtianity, but that we may as yet ſee upon it the impreſs of its old ſignification, and be thereby therefore induced to believe, that they, who firſt uſed it in a Chriſtian ſenſe, took their meaſures from the former one. For, as the aforeſaid

(h) *Inſtit. li. 4. cap. 14. Sect. 13.*

ſaid perſons name-ſake (even *John Calvin* the Lawyer) hath obſerv'd (*i*), the word *fides*, among the Latins, ſignified *belief* *, as well as *veracity*, or *fidelity*, and ſo was not at all removed from one great ſenſe of it in Chriſtianity: And though it was more uſually ſet to denote the other, yet if we may judge ought by the words *fido*, and *confido*, which are at leaſt of the ſame linage with it, the word *fides* came to ſignifie veracity, and fidelity, not ſo much from any other reaſon, as becauſe thoſe vertues are the juſt object of mens *truſt*, which is another, and no leſs uſual ſignification of it in Chriſtianity. Which notion I am the more confirmed in, becauſe though *Tully* do in one place † repreſent it as having its name from *fit quod dicitur*, yet as he doth even there intimate it to be a harſh *etymology*, and rather a piece of *Stoical*

(i) *Lex. Juridic. in Verbo* fides.

* Virgil. Æneid. *li.* 4. v. 12.
Credo equidem, nec vana fides, genus eſſe deorum.

Liv. Hiſt. *li.* 1.
Hæc ferme, Romulo regnante, domi, militiæque geſta: quorum nil abſonum fidei divinæ originis, divinitatiſque poſt mortem creditæ fuit, i. e. *quâ creditus eſt natus fuiſſe ex Marte.*

Idem Liv. paulo poſt.
Mirum quantum illi viro nunciauti hæc fides fuerit.

† De Offic. li. 1. *Ex quo (quanquam hoc videbitur fortaſſe cuipiam durius) tamen audeamus imitari Stoicos, qui ſtudioſe inquirunt unde verba ſint ducta; credamuſque quia fiat quod dictum eſt, appellatam fidem.*

confidence

confidence, than a well grounded conjecture: So he himſelf elſewhere † uſeth the word *Fides* for that truſt we repoſe in another upon the account of his wiſdom, and juſtice. For ought therefore that doth as yet appear, there is not any reaſon to believe, but that Chriſtianity had a reſpect, in it's words to the Antient ſignification of them; And conſequently but that it had ſo in the uſe of the word *Sacrament*, and intended it a like ſignification with that, which it before had, and was now very prevalent in the world. But beſide the footing that ſignification of it had gotten, and by which therefore we may reaſonably imagine, that the firſt Chriſtians guided themſelves in the uſe of the ſame word in Chriſtianity, it is as certain that the ſame perſons, led thereto by the language of the Scripture, did both conceive of, and repreſent the *life*, and inſtitution of a Chriſtian under the notion of a *Military* one. For if ſo, it is yet more reaſonable to think, that they

† *Fides autem ut habeatur, duabus rebus effici poteſt, ſi exiſtimabimur adepti conjunctam cum juſtitiâ prudentiam. Nam & iis fidem habemus, quos plus intelligere, quam nos arbitramur. Juſtis autem, & fidis hominibus, id eſt viris bonis, ita fides habetur, ut nulla ſit in his fraudis, injuriæque ſuſpicio.* De Offic. 2.

made uſe of their *Sacrament* to expreſs ſome of their own Inſtitutions by. Now that the firſt Chriſtians, led thereto by the language of the Scripture, did both conceive of, and repreſent the Chriſtian ſtate as a *Military* one, will ſoon appear if we look either into thoſe Scriptures, or the Antient Writers. Witneſs for the former, St. *Paul*'s ſpeaking in one (*k*) place of his *fighting as one, that did not beat the air*, and in another (*l*) of his having *fought a good fight*; his calling upon *Timothy* in a third (*m*) to *fight the good fight of Faith*, as, in fine, upon the generality of Chriſtians (*n*) to prepare themſelves for that fight, by putting on the whole Armour of God, which therefore he doth there reckon up, and prompts them to buckle on. For theſe, and other expreſſions of the like nature, ſhow plainly enough, that even the Penmen of the New Teſtament had that opinion of a Chriſtian ſtate, and that accordingly they repreſented it under the notion of a *military* one. The like evidence there is of their opinion of it, who took upon them to hand down that doctrine,

(*k*) 1 Cor. 9. 26.

(*l*) 2 Tim. 4. 7.

(*m*) 1 Tim. 6. 12.

(*n*) Eph. 6. 11, *&c.*

doctrine, which they receiv'd from the other: Witneſs *Tertullian*'s repreſenting the Chriſtians in general as the *Militia* of God (*o*), and affirming the *Stations*, that were in uſe among them, to have had their original from the *Military* ones; His repreſenting that Souldier, who refuſed to put on his Crown, as *more the Souldier of God* (*p*), than of the *Emperor*; His afterwards deſcribing the ſame perſon (*q*) as one *clad all in red with the hope of his own blood, ſhod with the preparation of the Goſpel, girt with the ſharper Word of God, armed Cap-a-pe out of the Apoſtle, and in a ſhort time to be crowned with the Crown of Martyrdom, and to receive the donative of Chriſt in priſon.* For what are theſe but pregnant proofs of the likeneſs they conceived between a Chriſtian, and a Military ſtate, and conſequently that, in agreement thereto they ſpake of their own *Sacraments* in the ſame Military ſtrain? Though if neither that will ſuffice, we have their own *expreſs* applications of the *word* to warrant us, and accordingly either making the Sacraments a badge

(o) *De orat. c.* 14.

(p) *De coronâ c.* 1.

(q) *Ibid.*

of their military ſtate, or arguing from mens taking upon them the Sacraments of *Chriſt*'s warfare, the unlawfulneſs of obliging themſelves by a *humane* one. For, agreeably to the former of theſe, we find the fore-quoted *Tertullian* affirming †, that *we were called even then to the Militia of God, when we anſwered to the words of the Sacrament*, meaning that of Baptiſm; As *Arnobius* yet more plainly *, where he repreſents one, *who denies the Faith*, as one *who depoſits the Sacraments of the ſaving Militia of God*. For what was this but to ſay, that, in reſpect to that warfare, which Chriſtianity commands us to take up, they call'd the principal inſtitutions of it by the name of *Sacraments*, and conſequently that they made uſe of the *word* in a ſenſe analogous to that, in which it had been formerly taken? On the other ſide, when the forementioned *Tertullian* *, where he goes about to

† *Vocati ſumus ad militiam Dei vivi, jam tunc cum in Sacramenti verba reſpondimus.* Ad Martyr. c. 3.

* Adv. Gentes li. 2. *Quod ab dominis ſe ſervi cruciatibus affici, quibus ſtatuerunt, malunt, ſolvi conjuges Matrimoniis, exhæredari à parentibus liberos, quam fidem rumpere Chriſtianam, & ſalutaris militiæ Sacramenta deponere.*

* De Coronâ. c. 11. *Etenim, ut ipſam cauſam coronæ militaris aggrediar, puto prius conquirendum, an ſit totum Chriſtianis militia conveniat. Quale eſt alioquin de accidentibus retractare, cum à præcedentibus culpa ſit? Credimuſne humanum Sacramentum divino ſuperinduci licere, & in alium Dominum reſpondere poſt Chriſtum?*

prove

prove the unlawfulneſs of a Chriſtians taking upon him a Military life, demands *whether any man can think it lawful to ſuperinduce a humane, or* Military *Sacrament upon a divine one, and to anſwer to another Maſter after Chriſt*; What other can he be thought to mean, than that the *divine*, and *humane* Sacraments were of one, and the ſame general nature, that the divine Sacraments had therefore the name of the humane ones impos'd upon them, and ſo the word *Sacrament* of like ſignification in them both. The only thing to be farther enquired into is *how far* this likeneſs of ſignification may be ſuppoſed to prevail in the divine or Chriſtian intendment of it.

And here in the firſt place it is eaſie to obſerve, that the word *Sacrament*, in the Chriſtian intendment of it, did equally imply the thing, to which it was attributed to lay an *Obligation* upon him, that took it, to intend thoſe things, to which it related. For beſides that otherwiſe it could have had little affinity with the *Military* Sacrament, the principal deſign whereof was to lay an Obli-

gation upon thoſe, that took it; The firſt time we find any mention made of a Chriſtian Sacrament, we find mention alſo made † of the Chriſtians *obliging themſelves* by it, to the doing of thoſe things, that are there remembred. It is no leſs eaſie to ſee, ſecondly, by the account we before gave of the Symbolizing of our Sacraments with the Military one, and particularly by a paſſage before remembred out of *Tertullian*, that the ſame word, in the Chriſtian ſenſe of it, did equally imply the things, to which it was attributed, to lay an Obligation upon thoſe, that took them, to intend that warfare, to which Chriſtianity called them. I add thirdly, as no leſs evident from the premiſes, the ſame words implying the things, to which it was attributed, to oblige the party, that took them, to be faithful to their General Chriſt, and who was the Captain, as well as the Author of our Spiritual warfare. As is evident, among other things, from *Tertullian*'s making the divine Sacrament to be accompanied with a profeſſion of our obedience unto

† Plin. Epiſt. li. 10. ep. 97.

unto *Chriſt our Maſter*, and accordingly arguing from thence the unlawfulneſs of taking upon us the *Military* one, and ſo *anſwering to another Maſter* after him. I ſay Fourthly, that as the *Military* Sacrament did, among other things, oblige the party, that took it, to the avoiding of ſeveral things, which were inconſiſtent with the orderly management of an Army, and particularly to the avoiding of *theft*, and other ſuch like *injuſtices*, as appears by the form of it in *Gellius* (*r*), ſo the word *Sacrament*, in the Chriſtian intendment of it, did equally imply that, to which it was attributed, to oblige the perſons, that took it, *not to commit Theft, or Robberies* *, *or Adulteries, not to falſifie their truſts, or, when they were called upon* to reſtore, *to deny any thing that was committed to their cuſtody*. I obſerve laſtly, that as the Military Sacrament was attend with religious rites, yea received both its denomination, and a great deal of its force from them;

(*r*) Noct. Attic. li. 16. c. 4.

* Plin. Ep. li. 10. ep. 97. *Affirmabant autem hanc fuiſſe ſummam vel culpæ ſuæ, vel erroris, quod eſſent ſoliti ſtato die ante lucem convenire*, &c. *ſeque Sacramento non in ſcelus aliquod obſtringere, ſed ne furta, ne latrocinia, ne adulteria committerent, ne fidem fallerent, ne depoſitum appellatinegarent.*

ſo the word *Sacrament*, in the Chriſtian intendment of it, was meant to denote the like Religious Rites, and the Obligation of thoſe, that took the Sacrament, by them. Which is ſo true, that in *Tertullian* firſt, and afterwards in other Chriſtian Writers, the word *Sacrament* came eſpecially to be applied to the *ritual* part thereof, yea to ſuch things, as had little of a *Sacrament* properly ſo called beſide the ceremonies thereof.

Of what uſe theſe Obſervations may be, will then more clearly appear, when I proceed (as I mean to do in the following Diſcourſe) from the ſignification of the word *Sacrament* to the unfolding of the *nature* of the *things* intended by it. The only uſe I ſhall make of them at preſent, is, that if we will conſider the nature of a *Sacrament* in its full latitude, we ought to conſider it as well with reſpect to *our ſelves*, and thoſe Obligations it lays upon us, as with relation to *God*, and *Chriſt*, and thoſe *Graces*, which it was intended, *on their part*, to *ſignifie*, or *convey* to the worthy receiver of it.

PART

PART II.

Of the Nature of a SACRAMENT.

The Contents.

A Sacrament ſhewn to be a Relative *thing, more particularly ſuch a Relative thing, as hath the relation of an* outward, and viſible ſign *of that, of which it is a Sacrament. That therefore aſſign'd as the* Genus *of a Sacrament, and enquiry thereupon made after thoſe* eſſential attributes, *which difference it from other outward and viſible ſigns. Which is endeavour'd to be evinc'd from the ſeveral things to which a Sacrament relates, the* manner *of its relation to each of them, and the* foundation

tion *of that relation. The* things, *to which a Sacrament relates, ſhewn in the general to be Sacred, or Divine, more particularly, divine Graces, and humane Duties, that New Covenant, which connects them together, and that body of men, which is confederated by it. To the firſt of which a Sacrament relates in the* nature *of a ſign, a means of conveyance, and a pledge; To the ſecond in the* nature *of a ſimple ſign, or declaration, and (by means of that Covenant, which it conciliates) as an Obligation to them; To the third in the* nature *of ſuch a ſign, as ſerves alſo to give being to, or renew it; And to the fourth, and laſt in the* nature *of a Diſcriminative ſign, or badge, and as a means of bringing particular men into it, or continuing them in it. The* foundation *of all theſe relations ſhewn to be the* Inſtitution *of Chriſt, as that again, not ſo much as delivered by him, as applied to thoſe elements, in which they are ſubjected, by a declaration of the purport of the Inſtitution, and by doing ſuch other things to them, as either the general precepts*

precepts of Chriſtianity, or the more particular precepts of the inſtitution oblige to the performance of. A brief recollection made of all the forementioned particulars, and the eſſential attributes of a Sacrament deduced from thence, and exemplified in ſeveral definitions of it.

I Have hitherto entreated of the ſignification of the word *Sacrament*, I have ſhewn what they meant by it, who firſt made uſe of it, and what they alſo intended, who firſt applied it to thoſe *Chriſtian Inſtitutions*, which are now commonly known by that *name*. But becauſe no names are ſo expreſſive of the nature of things, as to bring men to a clear, and perfect underſtanding of them: And becauſe, though ſome names ſhould be thought to be ſo expreſſive, yet we cannot well conceive ſo of this by any thing that hath hitherto appeared concerning the ſignification of it; Therefore to ſatisfie our ſelves yet more fully concerning the *nature* of the thing intended by it, we muſt take another courſe, and particularly by finding out

Queſtion What meaneſt thou by this word Sacrament?

Anſwer. I mean an outward, and viſible ſign of an inward, and ſpiritual Grace given unto us, ordained by Chriſt himſelf as a means, whereby we receive the ſame, and a pledge to aſſure us thereof.

out under what *head* of things it ought to be placed, and what are the *eſſential attributes* thereof: Whereof the former among the Learned hath the name of its *Genus*, the latter of the *ſpecifical difference* thereof.

It is the obſervation of the Judicious *Hooker* (*a*), where he entreats of the nature, and neceſſity of the *Sacraments*, that as *no one part of religion hath been more diverſly interpreted, or diſputed of*, ſo that *diverſity* hath eſpecially ariſen from the *mixedneſs of their natures*, and from that *variety of properties*, which flow from it. Which therefore whilſt they, who handled this Argument, have but imperfectly conſidered, they have not only taken up different notions of a Sacrament, but thought themſelves obliged to combat thoſe, who have aſſigned it other properties, than what they themſelves had taken notice of. I find no reaſon to queſtion the truth of that Obſervation of his, either as to the *variety* of mens conceits concerning a Sacrament, or that *mixt nature* of a Sacrament, to which he entitles the variety of the other. But neither the

(*a*) Eccl. Pol. li. 5. ſect. 57.

the one, nor the other will hinder us from diſcovering, under what *head* of things to place it, which is that we are firſt of all to intend. For whether we conſider a Sacrament, as to *Chriſt*, or to *our ſelves*, as a means in his hands to profit us, or in ours to declare our piety toward him; Whether again we conſider it, in the hands of Chriſt, as a means whereby he *ſignifies*, and *ſeals* his own graces, or as a means whereby he *conveys*, as well as either *ſignifies*, or *ſeals* them; Yet ſtill it will be found to be in the number of *relative* things, or ſuch, whoſe very being conſiſts in the reſpect they bear unto another: Becauſe, whatever it may be in it ſelf, yet it is not conſidered as ſuch, but with reſpect to that *Grace* of Chriſt, which it ſo ſignifies, or ſeals, or exhibits, or with reſpect to that piety, which it is intended on our part to declare. But ſo the Scriptures themſelves will oblige us to conſider a Sacrament, as is evident from what they teach concerning Baptiſm, and the Lord's Supper, which are, if not the only, yet the moſt undoubted Sacraments

of

of our Religion. For, agreeably thereto, they prompt us to conſider the water of Baptiſm (*b*), not *as putting away the filth of the Fleſh* (which is the proper conſideration of water, as ſuch) but as *waſhing us from* (c) *our ſins*, and *purifying* thoſe *conſciences* (d), wherein they are; As, on the other ſide, the Bread, and Wine of the Lord's Supper, not as intended *to ſatisfie* (e) *our hunger*, but as (f) *the body, and blood of Chriſt*, or rather the *communication* (g) *of it*. For well may we look upon thoſe things as *relative* ones, which we are not only forbidden to conſider in their natural properties, but prompted to attribute to them the properties of others, yea to conſider in the ſame notion with them. I ſay ſecondly, that as a Sacrament is a *relative* thing, and that therefore to be reputed as the remote *Genus* of it, ſo it is of the number of *thoſe* relative ones, which are *ſigns*, or *repreſentations* of what they ſo relate unto. As is evident in part from what we were before taught concerning the water of Baptiſm, and will be yet more, when I come to ſhew the Analogy

(*b*) 1 Pet. 3. 21.

(*c*) Act. 22. 16.

(*d*) 1 Pet. 3. 21.

(*e*) 1 Cor. 11. 34.

(*f*) Matt. 26. 26, *&c.*

(*g*) 1 Cor. 10. 16.

Analogy there is between the elements of each Sacrament, and that, to which they do relate. For if the water of Baptiſm, (though not to be conſidered as to any proper purification, yet) is to be conſidered under the notion of a *Laver* (*h*), and accordingly as *waſhing* (*i*) thoſe who are ſprinkled with it, from their ſins, then ought it to be look'd upon under the notion of a *ſign* of that, to which it doth ſo relate. Becauſe whatever force the Baptiſmal water may have toward the doing away our ſins, yet it cannot be ſuppoſed, becauſe ſin is no corporal ſpot, to waſh us from them; And that term of *waſhing* therefore attributed to it upon the account of the Analogy there is between the property of water conſidered in its own nature, and that of the ſame water as conſecrated into a Sacrament. Which will conſequently make the water of Baptiſm, (and, by proportion thereto, the elements of other Sacraments) not only to have a relation to ſomething of another nature, but alſo to be a *ſign*, or repreſentation of it. I ſay nothing at preſent of a Sacrament's being

(*h*) Tit. 3. 5.

(*i*) Act. 22. 16.

being a *means of conveying* ſomething to us, as well as a *ſign* of it, and a *pledge to aſſure* us of it, as well as either; Partly, becauſe that, which hath the nature of a *ſign*, may alſo be made uſe of as a *means* of conveyance, and a pledge; And partly becauſe the firſt intention of a Sacrament is to ſignifie that, of which it is ſo, and that therefore by which it comes to do ſo, more commodiouſly aſſigned as the *Genus* of it. And I ſhall only add, that foraſmuch as a *ſign* is nothing elſe, than that, *which offers it ſelf* to the *ſenſes*, and *that*, of which it is a ſign, *to the* underſtanding; Foraſmuch therefore as it muſt be ſubjected in ſome ſenſible being, and (if it be alſo a formal ſign, or that which repreſents the thing, of which it is ſo) in ſuch a being, as is apparent to the eyes; Foraſmuch laſtly as Baptiſm, and the Lords Supper (which are, at leaſt, the moſt conſiderable Sacraments of our Religion) are ſubjected in ſuch ſenſible, yea viſible beings; It cannot but be deemed reaſonable, for the more clear declaring of the nature

ture of a Sacrament, to repreſent it (as our *Catechiſm* doth) as an *outward, and viſible* one.

That therefore being to be looked upon as the *Genus* of a Sacrament, or that general head of things, under which we are to conceive of it; Enquire we in the next place after the *eſſential attributes* thereof, and by which it will not only be more perfectly known what it is, but alſo be more clearly diſcriminated from thoſe things, which are of the ſame general nature. Now as the eſſence of a relative thing conſiſts in the relation it bears to another, and that relative thing therefore, whereof we ſpeak, in the relation which it bears to that, of which it is a ſign; So the eſſential attributes of a Sacrament cannot therefore be better learned, than by the knowledge of *thoſe things*, to which it doth relate, the *manner* of its relation to them, and the *foundation* of it.

I. In the *General* I obſerve, that that, to which a Sacrament relates, muſt be ſomething *Sacred*, or *Divine*, as both the term of *Sacrament*,

and the known nature of *Baptiſm*, and the Lord's Supper perſwade. Which is the rather to be remarked, to diſtinguiſh it from ſuch *ſigns*, as relate to *civil* matters, and particularly from the purely *military* Sacrament. For though even that had a relation to God, as whoſe name it did invoke, and to whoſe truth, and juſtice it did appeal; yet it referr'd to God rather as a *witneſs* of what it affirmed, than as to the *object* of it. For the object of a Military Sacrament was no other than the being faithful to thoſe Generals, under which the Souldiers, that took that Sacrament, were.

I obſerve more particularly, that as that may be termed Sacred, or Divine, which hath God either for its principle, or object, and accordingly *flows from him to us*, or *paſſeth from us to him*; ſo a Sacrament relates both to the one, and the other, and ought to be looked upon as ſuch. That a Sacrament relates to that, which *flows from God to us*, is a thing neither denyed, nor forgotten by any, and is evident from what the Scriptures teach concerning

cerning Baptiſm, and the Lord's Supper. Witneſs, for the former, their repreſenting Baptiſm as the *laver* (*k*) *of Regeneration*, which is a thing we muſt have from God (*l*), and as a thing, by which we muſt obtain *forgiveneſs of ſins* (*m*), which is as undoubtedly (*n*) another. For the latter, the ſame Scriptures requiring us to look upon the elements thereof, as that *body of Chriſt, which was* (o) *given for us*, and that blood which was ſhed for many (*p*), for the forgiveneſs of ſins. For as theſe, and the former benefits are ſuch as manifeſtly come from God, ſo they are alike manifeſtly repreſented as the conſequents of the former Sacraments, and a Sacrament therefore, as ſuch, to be looked upon as having a relation to that, which *flows from God to us*. The only difficulty, in my opinion, is to ſhew a Sacrament to relate equally to that, which *paſſeth from us to God*, and imports our duty, and ſervice. But beſides that the Antients apprehended no ſuch difficulty in it, becauſe giving it the title of a *Sacrament*, in reſpect of that *Obligation* *, which it lays upon the

(*k*) Tit. 3. 5.

(*l*) Joh. 3. 5.

(*m*) Act. 2. 38.

(*n*) Expl. of the Lords Pr. *forgive us*, &c.

(*o*) Luk 22. 19.

(*p*) Matt. 26. 28.

* See the prec. Diſc.

Receivers of it; The Scriptures have ſaid enough concerning Baptiſm, and the Lords Supper, to confirm us in the belief of this relation of them. Only becauſe I would not too much anticipate my Diſcourſe concerning thoſe Sacraments, and, beſide that, may have another occaſion to ſpeak more largely to this Argument, I will content my ſelf at preſent with what St. *Peter* hath obſerv'd of Baptiſm *(q)*, and which I have elſewhere *(r)* given a more particular account of. For if, as that Apoſtle inſinuates, and hath accordingly been more largely confirmed, the *ſtipulation or anſwer of a good conſcience toward God* be a conſiderable part of Baptiſm; If it be ſo conſiderable a part of it, as to give it much of that *ſavingneſs* which it hath; Then muſt that Sacrament be thought (becauſe the ſtipulation of a good Conſcience is of that nature) to relate to ſomething, that muſt come from us, as well as to thoſe things, which flow from God to us. It is true indeed that our Church, where it ſets it ſelf to define a Sacrament, takes no notice of this object of it; Whether it were through a ſimple inad-

(q) 1 Pet. 3. 21.
(r) Explic. of the Prel. Queſt. and Anſwers, *&c.*

inadvertency, and from which our Church doth no where pretend it ſelf to be free, or (which I rather think) that it might give ſo much the more particular an account of that other, and more conſiderable object of it, even that inward, and Spiritual Grace, which it was intended to ſignifie, and exhibit, and aſſure. For that our Church did not wholly forget this ſecond object of a Sacrament (even that duty, and ſervice of ours, which it doth equally ſignifie, and prompt us to declare) is evident from its before minding the Catechumen of his Baptiſmal vow (*ſ*), and from the declaration it elſewhere (*t*) makes, that they who are to be baptized muſt alſo *for their parts* promiſe the renouncing of the Devil, and his works, and both Faith and Piety toward God: That, as it ſhews her to have looked upon Baptiſm as a *federal rite*, or ceremony, ſo that ſhe equally believed it to relate to our duty, and ſervice, as well as to thoſe divine benefits, we receive from the Author of it. Let it remain therefore for an undoubted truth, and the acknowledged Do-

(*ſ*) Prelim. Queſt. and Anſw. of the Cat.

(*t*) Office of Publ. Bapt.

ſtrine of our Church, that a Sacrament relates as well to what is to *paſs from us to God*, as to what is to *come from God to us*, and that accordingly it may be ſo far forth defined, ſuch an outward, and viſible ſign, whereby we make a declaration of our piety toward God, as Mr. *Calvin* (*u*) hath very well obſerved.

(*u*) Inſtit. li. 4. c. 14. §. 1.

I may not forget to add, for the farther clearing of this head, that as a Sacrament relates firſt, and chiefly to that, which *paſſeth from God to us*; ſo we are to conceive of that, to which it ſo relates, under the notion of a *Grace given unto us*, yea of *an inward, and ſpiritual one*. That we ought to conceive of it under the notion of *a grace given unto us*, is evident from thoſe Texts, which I but now made uſe of to ſhew, that a Sacrament relates to *that* which *paſſeth from God to us*. For inſtancing in ſuch things, as have the nature of *benefits*, and, ſo far forth therefore, are to be looked upon as *Graces*, or *Favours*, inſtancing moreover in ſuch benefits, as are manifeſtly *the iſſues of the Divine Goodneſs*, yea which the Scripture expreſly affirms

firms to be *given* to us by him (for ſo it doth as to that (w) *Body of Chriſt*, which is the foundation of them all) they muſt conſequently oblige us to conceive of that, to which a Sacrament relates, as a *Grace given unto us*. But neither will there be leſs evidence from thence, if thoſe Texts be well conſidered, that that *Grace*, to which a Sacrament relates, *is an inward and Spiritual one*. For as our Church means no other by an *inward and Spiritual Grace*, than that which conduceth in an eſpecial manner to the welfare of our inward man, or Spirit, (as is evident from its making the *Body and Blood of Chriſt* the inward, and Spiritual Grace of the Lords Supper, and which it cannot be in any other ſenſe, than that it hath ſuch an effect upon us) ſo the Texts before alledged attribute ſuch Graces to the Sacraments, as are, in that ſenſe at leaſt, *inward and Spiritual ones*: Witneſs their attributing to them the Graces of *regeneration, and forgiveneſs*, which are as it were the formal cauſes of our welfare, and the grace of *Chriſts Body, and Blood*,

(w) Luk. 22. 19.

which is the meritorious cauſe thereof, and under God, and by his acceptation, in the place of an Efficient alſo.

I obſerve farther, that as a Sacrament relates to ſuch things, as have the nature of divine *Graces*, or *humane duties*; ſo thoſe graces, and duties being parts of the *New Covenant*, and receiving all their force from it, a Sacrament muſt conſequently relate to that *New Covenant*, to which they do belong, and from which they receive all their force. Of which yet if there remain any doubt, it will not be difficult to clear it from what the Scripture aſſures us concerning Baptiſm, and the Lords Supper; St. *Peter* (*x*) repreſenting the former under the notion of a *Stipulation*, or *Contract*, as our Saviour the Cup of the other (*y*) as the *New Covenant in his Blood for the remiſſion of* thoſe *ſins*, for which it was ſhed. For that that is in truth the meaning of the words καινὴ διαθήκη, and not (as we uſually render it) the *New Teſtament* in it, is not only evident from the word διαθήκη being alway ſo uſed by the *Greek Tranſlatours* of the Old Teſtament, and

(*x*) 1 Pet. 3. 21.
(*y*) Luk. 22. 20. Matt. 26. 28.

and whom the Writers of the New Teſtament generally follow, but from the oppoſition, which the Scriptures of both Teſtaments (z) make between the καινὴ διαθήκη, and the παλαιὰ even where * there is the greateſt appearance of its being to be tranſlated a *Teſtament*. For the παλαιὰ διαθήκη being certainly a *Covenant*, and accordingly expreſſed by the *Hebrews*, by the word ברית, which is never uſed in any other ſenſe, it is but reaſonable to believe, that that καινὴ διαθήκη, which is oppoſed to it, is of the ſame nature: Becauſe as it hath the ſame word to expreſs it, and is therefore in reaſon to be looked upon as ſo far the ſame; ſo it would otherwiſe be different from the *Old* as to its general nature, as well as particular quality, which the ſole mention of its *newneſs* forbids us to believe; Oppoſitions (like exceptions from a general rule) ſuppoſing an identity there, where no oppoſition is taken notice of. And indeed, though the word διαθήκη may ſeem in one place to require a different rendering, even there †, where mention is made of its

(z) Jer. 3, 31. &c. Heb. 8. 8, &c.
* Heb. 9. 15–18.
† Heb. 9. 17.

its being *of no force* till *he, by whom it was made, was dead*; Yet as even that did not hinder our Tranſlatours from rendering it a *Covenant* both in the foregoing *, and following (a) Chapters, ſo that place will not only admit of the notion of a *Covenant*, but be found (all things conſidered) to require it of us. For with what ſenſe firſt of all can our Saviour be ſaid to be the *Mediatour of the New* (b) *Teſtament*, upon the ſenſe of which expreſſion the following periods do depend. *And for this cauſe he is the Mediator of the New Teſtament, that, by means of death for the redemption of the Tranſgreſſions, that were under the firſt Teſtament, they, which are called, might receive the promiſe of an eternal inheritance.* For ſhall we ſay that Chriſt may be ſtiled the *Mediator of the New Teſtament*, becauſe interpoſing himſelf between two perſons, that concurr to the making of it? But as a Teſtament is the Act of one, and not of more, and therefore admitteth not of any ſuch mediation; ſo the New Teſtament is ſuppoſed to be the Act of Chriſt, and he therefore rather

*—8. 9, &c.
(a)—10. 28.
(b)—9. 15.

ther the Maker, than the *Mediatour* of it. Shall we then ſay, that Chriſt is the Mediator of the New Teſtament, becauſe interpoſing between the maker of that Teſtament, and thoſe who are the Legatees in it? But by this means God the Father ſhall become the Teſtator, which, if death be required to make him ſuch, he can by no means be. Shall we ſay laſtly, that Chriſt may be looked upon as a Mediator of the New Teſtament, becauſe by means of that Teſtament of his taking up the difference between God, and Man? But that is rather to make him a Mediator *by a Teſtament*, than *of one*, which Chriſt is here affirmed to be. So difficult will it be found to make any tolerable ſenſe of thoſe words, if we underſtand them (as our Tranſlators prompt us) of the *Mediator of a Teſtament*: Whereas, if we underſtand them of the *Mediator of a Covenant*, the ſenſe will be clear, and plain; Becauſe as there are two parties required to the making of a Covenant, and ſuch who do, for the moſt part, need a Mediator to bring them to it, ſo God, and

Man

Man are manifeſtly the Parties of the New Covenant, and brought to enter into it by the mediation of Chriſt. If it be alſo ſaid, as it is, that the Mediator of the New Covenant brings the Parties concerned to it *by his death*, it is no more than will be found to be agreeable to the *Eaſtern* mode of making Covenants, and particularly to the manner of making that Covenant, which was of old between God, and the Iſraelites. For as that Covenant (and indeed all the kindneſs that paſſed between them) was brought about by the mediation of Sacrifices (c), and the blood of thoſe Sacrifices therefore ſtiled *the blood of the Covenant* (d), ſo Chriſt, by the *blood* (e) *of his Croſs* brought about this New Covenant between God, and us, and ſo, as the *Author to the Hebrews* ſpeaks, became the *Mediator* of it. If it be ſaid yet farther, that Chriſt became the Mediator of the New Covenant, *that they, who were called might receive the promiſe of an eternal inheritance*; That alſo will be found to be as agreeable to the notion of a *Covenant*, as it is to that of a *Teſtament*: Becauſe,

(c) Exo. 24. 5.

(d) —— 8.

(e) Col. 1. 19.

cauſe, as an inheritance may paſs by other means beſide that of a Teſtament, ſo the Children of *Iſrael* came to the inheritance of the Land of *Canaan* by a Covenant (*f*) between God, and their Progenitor *Abraham*, yea by ſuch a Covenant, as was conciliated by the mediation (*g*) of a Sacrifice. That therefore being the ſenſe of thoſe words of the Apoſtle, and ſo, as I think, evinced to be by no contemptible proofs, it will be but reaſonable to give a like ſenſe to the following ones (*h*), becauſe but a proof of the former, if it may be made appear, that they are capable of it. Which that they are, will appear from the *Tranſlation* I ſhall now ſubjoyn, and which, if it be duly conſidered, will be found to be no forced one. For * *where a Covenant is, there muſt of neceſſity* [even by that neceſſity which aroſe from the Antient mode of making Covenants] *be the death of that Mediator, that made it. For a Covenant becomes firm after thoſe Mediators,*

(*f*) Gen. 15. 7, 8, 18.

(*g*) Gen. 15. 9.

(*h*) Heb. 9, 16, 17, 18.

* Ὅπου γὰρ διαθήκη θάνατον ἀνάγκη φέρεσθαι τοῦ διαθεμένου. Διαθήκη γὰρ ἐπὶ νεκροῖς βεβαία, ἐπεὶ μήποτε ἰσχύει ὅτε ζῇ ὁ διαθέμενος· ὅθεν οὐδ' ἡ πρώτη χωρὶς αἵματος ἐγκεκαίνισται, &c.

tors, that made it, are dead, for it is never of force, whilſt he, who ſo makes it, lives. Whereupon neither the firſt Covenant was dedicated without blood. For when Moſes had ſpoken every precept to all the people according to the Law, he took the blood of Calves, and of Goats with water, and ſcarlet Wool, and Hyſſop, and ſprinkled both the Book, and all the people, ſaying, This is the blood of the Covenant (i), *which God hath enjoyned unto you.*

(i) Exo. 24. 8.

That I render the words θάνατον τῦ διαθεμένε, *the death of the Mediator*, that makes the Covenant, is becauſe the Apoſtle ſpeaks in the verſe before of him, who makes the Covenant, not as a Party, but as a Mediator, and what is here ſaid therefore of the Maker of a Covenant to be underſtood of *ſuch* a Maker of it. That I render thoſe words διαθήκη γὰρ ἐπὶ νεκροῖς βεβαία, *for a Covenant becomes firm, after thoſe Mediators, who made it, are dead*, is becauſe thoſe words are intended as a confirmation of the former ones, and ſo in reaſon to be underſtood of the death of the ſame Mediators. In fine, that I render the words ἐπεὶ

μήποτε

μήποτε ἰσχύει, ὅτε ζῇ ὁ διαθέμενος, *for it is never of force, whilst he, who so makes it, lives*, is because those words, as the former, are a continuation, and confirmation of the foregoing Argument, and so still to be understood with reference to the same Mediator. All which things I have laid together, not so much out of a desire of being thought the Author of a new Interpretation (from which no man is more averse, where there is not some kind of necessity for it) but to clear up an acknowledged, and important truth, and which the Text, I have so long insisted upon, hath helped, more than any thing, to obscure. For as there is nothing more certain from the Scripture, nor more attested to by our own Translators, than that the dispensation of the Gospel ought to be looked upon under the notion of a Covenant; As there is nothing, in like manner, of more importance to us to know, and consider, because it will prompt us to the doing of our part in the Covenant, if we mean that God should do his; so, setting aside this Text of the Hebrews, there is not one, where

where this διαθήκη is mentioned, which will not as commodiously, or more be interpreted of a *Covenant*, than it can be thought to be of a *Testament*. Only, if some men swayed by their former prejudices, or by the *Latins* giving the *Codex* of the *Old*, and *New Law* the title of the *Old*, and *New Testament* † (though they also give them the more general title of *Instrumenta* *.) But if some men, I say, swayed by the one, or the other, think fit to continue to the former Text, and some others the notion of a *Testament*; As I shall not contend with them about it, for the reverence I my self bear to the judgment of the Antients, so I shall ask, as is but reason, their acknowledging in like manner that the words καινὴ διαθήκη do equally import a *new Covenant*, and particularly, where mention is made of the *Cup* of the Lords Supper being the *blood* of that διαθήκη, or a διαθήκη in it. Partly, because that old διαθήκη, to which it was

† Tertull. de jejun. c. 11. *Secundum utriusque Testamenti paraturam.*

* Idem Apol. c. 19. *Primam Instrumentis istis auctoritatem summa Antiquitas vindicat.* Ib. c. 21. *Sed quoniam edidimus antiquissimis Judæorum Instrumentis sectam istam esse suffultam.* Adv. Marc. li. 1. c. 13. *Quantas autem foveas in ista vel maxime epistola* [ad Romanos nempe] *Marcion fecerit auferendo quæ voluit, de nostri Instrumenti integritate parebit.*

was opposed, had the nature of a Covenant, and could not, unless very improperly, be stiled a *Testament*; And partly, because it was not only sealed with *blood*, but that blood also stiled the *blood of* (k) *the Covenant*. For that is enough to perswade (especially, when we otherwise know, that the dispensation of the Gospel is undoubtedly a Covenant) that our Saviour, when he represented the *Cup* of his Last Supper as the *blood of the* καινὴ διαθήκη, meant the blood of the *New Covenant*, and consequently that that Sacrament, and the other have a relation to it.

(k) Exo. 24. 8.

I will conclude what I have to say concerning those *things*, to which a Sacrament relates, when I have taken notice of its relating to that *body of men*, with whom this New Covenant is made, as well as to the Covenant it self. For that it doth so, we have the former instances of Baptism, and the Lords Supper to assure us, or rather what we learn from the Scriptures concerning them: St. *Paul* giving us to understand, that it is into that *body*, that we are

(*l*) 1 Cor. 12. 13. (*m*)—10. 17. baptized *(l)*, as, in like manner, that though *we be many*, *yet we become* one bread, and that one body *(m)* by partaking of the *bread* of the other Sacrament.

II. It appearing from the premiſes, what thoſe *things* are, to which a Sacrament relates, and the way therefore ſo far plained toward the diſcovery of the properties thereof, enquire we in the next place into the *nature* of that *relation*, which I have affirmed it to bear unto the other. For my more advantageous diſcovery whereof I will reſume each of thoſe *things*, to which it doth relate, and ſhew *what kind of relation* it beareth to them.

Now as the *firſt* of thoſe things is an *inward and Spiritual Grace*, that is to ſay, ſuch a one as conduceth in an eſpecial manner to the welfare of our inward man, or ſpirit; ſo we ſhall find a Sacrament, as to it, to have the nature of a *ſign*, or *viſible repreſentation* of it. A thing ſo acknowledged by all, by whom the Sacraments are acknowledged in any meaſure, that it will hardly be worth

worth our while to inſiſt upon it. It may ſuffice here to ſay, that as a *ſign* is ſo much of the Eſſence of a Sacrament, that it is the very *Genus* of it, and muſt therefore be ſuppoſed to be *ſuch*, as to all thoſe things to which it relates; ſo we ſhall find the Sacraments of Baptiſm, and the Lord's Supper to repreſent even to our eyes thoſe inward and ſpiritual graces, which are attributed to them. For thus the *water* of Baptiſm doth by that *cleanſing* quality, which is natural to it, and which, as ſuch, is a repreſentation of that ſpiritual Grace, which *purgeth* (n) *the Conſcience from dead works*, which are, as it were, the *filth* (o), and *pollution* of it. And thus too the Elements of the Lord's Supper do, as by other ways, and means, ſo by that which is done unto them; The *breaking* of the one ſerving to ſet forth the *breaking of Chriſts body* upon the Croſs, as the pouring out of the other doth the *ſhedding* of his blood at thoſe paſſages, which were made for it by the Nails, and Spear, that pierced him.

(n) Heb. 9. 14.

(o) 2 Cor. 7. 1.

But beſide that a Sacrament hath

the relation of a *ſign* to that inward, and ſpiritual Grace, which belongeth to it, it hath alſo the relation of *ſuch* a ſign, as is moreover an apt inſtrument to convey that grace, which is ſignified by it. I inſtance, for the proof hereof, in the Scriptures attributing ſuch effects to Baptiſm and the Lord's Supper, as are the immediate iſſues of thoſe graces, which are ſignified by them. For if it attribute ſuch effects to them, it muſt conſequently intimate them to be the conveyers of thoſe Graces, from whence they reſult, as which otherwiſe they could not be in a condition to produce. Now that the Scriptures attribute ſuch effects to the Sacraments before remembred, as are the immediate iſſues of thoſe graces, which are ſignified by them, will appear, as to *Baptiſm*, by their attributing to it a power of *waſhing away* (p) *the ſins of men.* For whether we underſtand thereby the waſhing away their *guilt*, or waſhing away the *pollution* of them, we ſhall ſtill find it to be the immediate iſſue of an inward, and ſpiritual Grace;

(p) Acts 22. 16.

Grace; It being the blood of Jeſus Chriſt (as the Scriptures (q) every where declare) that waſheth us from ſin in the former ſenſe, and the ſanctifying Graces of God's ſpirit (r), which *purifie us from it* in the other. If therefore the Sacrament of Baptiſm may be ſaid ſo to *waſh*, and *purifie*, it muſt be as it is an Inſtrument, whereby it conveys to us thoſe graces, to which that purification doth belong. But ſo the ſame Scriptures do yet more expreſly declare, as to that other Sacrament of our Religion, even the *Supper of the Lord*; St. *Paul* telling us (ſ) of the *bread* of it, that it is the *Communion*, or Communication *of Chriſt's* body, as of the *Cup* that goes along with it, that it is the *Communion of his blood*. For what other can we well underſtand by that *expreſſion* of his, than that they are an inſtrument, whereby God conveys, and we accordingly come to partake of that body, and blood of Chriſt, which is ſignified by them? This only would be added, for the clearer Explication of it; that when we repreſent the Sacrament as an inſtrument,

(q) Explic. of the Creed in the word **Dead.**

(r) Expl. of the Creed, in the words, **I believe in the Holy Ghoſt.**

(ſ) 1 Cor. 10. 16.

whereby God conveys to us that grace, which is ſignified by it, we do not mean thereby that it is a *natural* one, or ſuch as contains that grace in it, as a Veſſel doth liquor, or a cauſe its effect, but rather (as the Judicious *Hooker* (t) ſpeaks) as a *moral* inſtrument thereof; That is to ſay, as ſuch a one, to the uſe whereof God hath made a promiſe of his grace, and which accordingly he will accompany with the exhibition of the other.

(t) Eccl. Pol. li. 5. ſect. 57.

I deny not indeed but there are, who are otherwiſe perſwaded, and who accordingly either attribute a greater efficacy to a Sacrament, or deny even that, which we have attributed to it. Of the former ſort are they, who not contented to affirm that a Sacrament is an inſtrument, whereby God conveys grace to the worthy receiver of it, do moreover repreſent it under the notion of a *Phyſical* one, yea of *ſuch* a Phyſical one, as contains grace in it, as a cauſe doth its effect, and accordingly contributes by its own internal force to the producing of it, as well

as

as to the poſſeſſing us thereof. Even as a Chezil (for ſo they (*u*) explain themſelves) contributes to the formation of a Statue, or as a Hatchet to that Bed, (*w*) which is ſhaped by it. But as it appears by *Aquinas* (*x*), who was it may be the firſt framer of it, that that conceit had its original from the fear of making a Sacrament to be nothing but a *bare ſign* of grace, contrary to the opinion of the *Holy Fathers*; ſo nothing more therefore can be neceſſary toward the overthrowing of it, than to ſhew the groundleſneſs of that fear, which the doctrine before deliver'd will ſufficiently evince. For if it be but a *moral inſtrument*, whereby God conveys his own graces, it is certainly more than a *ſign*, yea it may, in ſome ſenſe, be ſaid to be a cauſe, as well as the inſtrument thereof. For as they, who attribute to a Sacrament the *efficacy* of a *cauſe*, make it to be no farther a cauſe of grace, than that it produceth in the Soul a diſpoſition (*y*) to receive it (by which means it is not ſo much the cauſe of grace, as of our receiving

(*u*) Hiſt. of Counc. of *Trent* li. 2.

(*w*) *Aquin. ſum. Part.* 3. *Qu.* 62. *Art.* 1.

(*x*) *Ibid.*

(*y*) Hiſt. of Counc. of *Trent* li. 2.

ving it) ſo ſuch a kind of cauſality will be found to belong to it, though we make a Sacrament to be no other than a means whereby we attain it: Becauſe it is ſo far forth by the force of a Sacrament, that grace comes to be in us, that without that we cannot ordinarily hope to attain it, nor fear to fail of it, where the other is duly receiv'd. The only difference as to this particular between the one, and the other opinion, is, that whereas the former makes a Sacrament to diſpoſe us to the reception of Grace, as well as to convey it; The latter ſuppoſeth that diſpoſition already produc'd, and conſequently leaves no place for the former operation. In that reſpect yet more agreeably to the Doctrine of the Scriptures, becauſe not only pre-requiring certain qualifications (z) of thoſe, that are to receive it, but aſſuring them, that if they come ſo qualifi'd, they ſhall not fail * of that grace, which the Sacrament was intended to convey; Theſe and the like aſſertions, as they ſuppoſe the Soul to be before diſpos'd, ſo leaving no place

(z) Act. 8. 36, 37. 1 Cor. 11.20. * Mark. 16. 16. Act. 2. 38.

for

for any other cauſality in a Sacrament, than its ſerving to us as a means of conveying that grace, which we are ſo diſpoſed to receive. And indeed as it doth not appear by any thing that Schoolman hath alledg'd, that the Antients ever attributed any other cauſality to a Sacrament (for though St. *Auguſtine*, as he is quoted by him, affirms the power of God to work by a Sacrament, yet he doth not affirm it to do ſo as by a Phyſical inſtrument) As it appears farther, even from that Schoolman, that St. *Bernard* was of opinion, that *Grace is no otherwiſe conveyed by a Sacrament, than a Canonry* in his time *was by a Book, or a Biſhoprick by Ring*; ſo there is no defect in the Inſtances of that *Father*, ſuppoſing a Book or a Ring to have been as much a means of conveying of thoſe preferments, as we affirm a Sacrament to be of the divine Grace. For in that caſe the delivery of a Ring, or a Book, would not only have been a *ſign*, whereby the delivery of thoſe preferments was declar'd, as *Aquinas* argues in the place before, but

but a ceremony by which they were actually made over, and without which they could not have been Canonically inveſted in them. I conclude therefore, that if a Sacrament be an inſtrument of Grace, it is a moral one, and ſuch as contributes no farther toward our partaking of it, than as it is a means to which God hath annex'd the promiſe of it, and which accordingly he will not fail (where the receiver is rightly diſpos'd) to accompany with the exhibition of the other.

But becauſe there are ſome, who are ſo far from owning a Sacrament to be a *phyſical* inſtrument of grace, that they will not ſo much as allow it to be a *moral one*; And becauſe ſuch a conceit may tend as much to the depretiating of a Sacrament, as the other ſeems to tend to the overvaluing of it; Therefore conſider we in the next place the pretenſions of thoſe, that entertain it, and the ſtrength, or rather weakneſs of thoſe pretenſions. There are who have thought (and it were to be wiſh'd that many more did not, who do not

not perhaps ſpeak it out) that a Sacrament, as to this particular is a bare ſign of the Divine Grace, and accordingly intended by God, only to awaken mens minds to conceive it, and their hearts to the embracing of it. What induced them ſo to opine, I am not able to ſay, unleſs it were, on the one hand an Univerſal acknowledgment of its being a ſign; and a fear, on the other, leſt if they made it any thing more, they ſhould approach too near to thoſe exceſſes, into which the former had caſt themſelves. But as it is a very ill way of chooſing opinions in Religion by the diſtance, which they bear to the exceſſes of other men; ſo the fondneſs of this cannot better be made appear, than by thoſe glorious effects, which are attributed to a Sacrament, and which, in ſtrictneſs of ſpeech, are the proper, and immediate iſſues of that which is ſignified by it. For that which is only a *ſign* being no way capable of producing ſuch effects, nor therefore with any reaſon of having ſuch effects attributed to it, we are in reaſon, where the

thing

thing will bear it, to conceive it under ſuch a notion, as will make thoſe effects yet more proper to it. Which we ſhall then, and then only do, when we make it ſuch a ſign, whereby (as was before ſaid) God conveys to us that Grace, by which thoſe effects are produc'd. Only as there are, who think all this may be ſalv'd, by making a Sacrament a *ſeal*, as well as a *ſign* of Grace, or rather a ſeal of that *New Covenant*, by which we are intituled to it; ſo it may not therefore be amiſs to examine that pretenſion alſo, and enquire into the validity thereof. What relation a Sacrament bears to the New Covenant, and how far the notion of a ſeal is competible to it, ſhall be examin'd in another place, and I will not therefore at preſent engage my ſelf in that diſpute. But I ſhall not ſtick to affirm, that how legitimate ſoever that notion of a Sacrament may be, yet it is no adequate one; As will appear in part from the inſufficiency of thoſe grounds upon which it is built, and in part alſo from the nature of that Covenant,

whereof

whereof they ſpeak, and of which they repreſent it as a ſeal. For the evidencing the former whereof we are to know, that as the ground upon which it is built is a paſſage of St. *Paul* (a), where he repreſents the *Circumciſion of Abraham* as a *ſeal of* that *righteouſneſs of faith, which he had yet being uncircumciſed*; ſo that Text, if it be well examin'd, will not be found to be a ſufficient proof of that, for which it is alledg'd. For not to require thoſe that urge that Text (which yet they ſeldom do) to make it appear that the *Chriſtian Sacraments* are of the ſame nature with *Circumciſion*, and conſequently that what is ſaid concerning Circumciſion ought to be alike underſtood of the other; Neither is what is there affirm'd concerning Circumciſion affirm'd concerning Circumciſion *in the* general, but only of the Circumciſion of *Abraham*, neither is it affirmed concerning his, that it was a ſeal of that Covenant, to which it did more immediately relate, but of that righteouſneſs, which he had before he enter'd into it. Things, which

(a) Rom. 4. 11.

if

if duly conſider'd, will render that teſtimony perfectly ineffectual, as to what it is deſigned to eſtabliſh. For as if *Abraham*'s caſe were different from that of other Circumciſed perſons, what may have been to him a ſeal of the righteouſneſs of Faith, may not yet have been ſuch to them; ſo that *Abraham*'s caſe was ſo far different from that of the generality of Circumciſed perſons, may appear from his having *before* had that righteouſneſs of Faith, which the other, becauſe Infants, could not be ſuppoſed to have had, or, at leaſt, not till they had it by the ſign of Circumciſion. And indeed, whoſoever ſhall conſider what the Apoſtles deſign in that place is, even to ſhew that the righteouſneſs of Faith is not annexed to Circumciſion, becauſe *Abraham* had it before he was Circumciſed, muſt conſequently believe that when he afterwards makes that Circumciſion of his a ſeal of that righteouſneſs in him, his meaning was only to ſay, that it was a teſtimony from God to him, and others, that he allowed of the former righteouſneſs,

neſs, as which if he had not done, he would not thus have entred with him into that other Covenant, of which Circumciſion was a ſign. By which way of arguing, what is here ſaid concerning Circumciſions being a *ſeal*, muſt not be underſtood of it, as it was in it ſelf, and ſo in a notion common to all that receiv'd it, but with reſpect to that righteouſneſs of *Abraham*'s, which it followed after in time, and which it could not but be look'd upon as ſome Confirmation from God of, becauſe a ſign of that New Covenant which God then enter'd into with him. As for that New Covenant, or any righteouſneſs of Faith accruing to *Abraham* by it; This St. *Paul* is ſo far from affirming his Circumciſion to have been a ſeal of, that he may ſeem rather to intimate, that it had no ſuch relation to it: Becauſe affirming it to have been a ſeal of that righteouſneſs, which he had before it, and which therefore he derived not from the Covenant of Circumciſion, or was under any neceſſity of having it ſeal'd to him by the ſign of it. I conclude

clude therefore, that how true ſoever it may be, that a Chriſtian Sacrament is a ſeal of the New Covenant; Yet the Text before mention'd conferrs not at all to the proving of it, and much leſs toward the ſhewing, that it hath no other relation than that of a *ſeal* either to that Covenant, or the graces of it. But beſide that the ſingle notion of a ſeal, how plauſible ſoever it may appear, hath no countenance from that Text, which is uſually produced for it; It will be found to have as little from the nature of that Covenant, of which it is repreſented as a ſeal. For that Covenant importing as well the conferring of preſent benefits, as a promiſe of future ones, it muſt conſequently if it be tranſacted by any viſible ceremony, make uſe of that ceremony to convey thoſe preſent benefits, as well as to aſcertain the exhibition of future ones; The former whereof a ſeal being no way proper for, or at leaſt not in the uſual notion of it, we are in reaſon to give the reſpective Sacraments of that Covenant another, and a more

effe-

effectual notion, even that of a *means*, whereby Christ, who is the Author of them, conveys his graces to mankind.

One only relation there is besides, which a Sacrament bears to the Divine Grace, even that of a *pledge to assure us thereof* (as our *Catechism* expresseth it) or (as the *25th Article* of our Church hath it) a *certain sure witness of it*. A relation, which stands sufficiently confirm'd by the *imperceptibleness* of the Divine *Grace* in it self, and the *aptness of a Sacrament* to manifest its approaches to us. For as the imperceptibleness of the Divine Grace in it self makes it but necessary, for the comfort of mankind, to have its approaches manifested to them by some other ways, and means; so a Sacrament as before describ'd, is an apt means to notifie it to us, yea assure us of the approaches of it: Partly, because a means to which God hath annexed the exhibition of his grace, and partly because such a means, as is apparent to mens senses, and which therefore whilst they are so assured of, they can as

little doubt of that Grace, which by the Decree of God is annexed to it.

Of the relation a Sacrament bears to the *Divine Grace* I have ſpoken hitherto, and ſhewn what *kind*, or kinds of relation it beareth to it; I come now, according to the method before laid down, to entreat of its relation to *our ſelves*, and of that *piety*, and *ſervice*, which we owe to the giver of it. For the underſtanding whereof we are to know, that as a Sacrament is undoubtedly a ſign of that, of which it is ſuch, ſo if it hath a relation to our piety (as I have before ſhewn it to have, and as the very *title* of a *Sacrament*, in the *Original* notion of it, obligeth us to conceive) it muſt be look'd upon as ſuch a ſign, whereby we may make a *declaration of that piety of ours*, as was before obſerv'd out of Mr. *Calvin*. But ſo we do in Baptiſm, as by other ways, and means, ſo eſpecially by our receipt of it, as a mark of our preſent acknowledgment of thoſe Divine Perſons, into whoſe names we are baptized,

and

and a reſolution for ever after to keep a good Conſcience to them: In the Euchariſt, by the grateful commemoration we there make of the death of Chriſt, *by* a declaration of our intimate union with thoſe, who partake with us thereof, and a reſolvedneſs to maintain it by all the offices of love, and kindneſs. Which things I do now only mention, becauſe I muſt inſiſt upon them more largely elſewhere, and whither it will be more proper to deferr the particular explication of them. Only as a *Sacrament* appears to have receiv'd its *Name* from the obligation it layes upon us to the performance of religious duties; ſo I cannot forbear to add, that as it is a declaration of that piety we owe to God, ſo it is alſo an obligation to the continuance of it: Becauſe (as I ſhall afterwards ſhew) it ſerves to conciliate, or renew that *New Covenant*, by which we are obliged to them.

From that *ſecond* thing, to which a Sacrament relates, paſs we to the *third*, even that *New Covenant*, in which both the former are founded,

and to which I ſhall not ſtick to affirm: *Firſt*, that a Sacrament hath the relation of a *ſign*, becauſe at once repreſenting the concernments of each party, what God obligeth himſelf to conferr, and what we make profeſſion of performing. But neither ſhall I ſtick to affirm, that it hath *moreover* the relation of *ſuch* a ſign, whereby the parties concern'd declare their *conſent* to it, and ſo make that, which was before but in a diſpoſition, to become a *Covenant*, or, at moſt, but in a weak, and tottering condition, to become actually, and firmly ſuch. Which if any man ſhall give the title of a *Seal* unto, I for my part ſhall not be at all diſpleas'd, becauſe *ſeals* were ſometime (*b*) made uſe of, for the declaration of ſuch a conſent. But I have my ſelf avoided to make uſe of the expreſſion, becauſe there may be ſome Ambiguity in it; And becauſe they, who have lately employ'd it, ſeem to look upon it as a thing, which rather adds ſtrength to mens faith concerning it, than to the Covenant it ſelf, and much leſs doth either give being

(b) Neh. 9. 38.

ing to it, or renew it. Whereas *Baptiſm*, in my opinion, is that, which firſt ſtrikes the Covenant between God, and man, and the Euchariſt, that which continues, or renews it after it hath been ſhatter'd by our miſcarriages; As is evident, as to the *former*, by its being the means of (c) *making Diſciples*, and the *laver of our* (d) *new birth*, and, as to the latter, by our Saviour's entitling it the *New Covenant* (e) *in his blood*, and *remitting* men to it for that *remiſſion of* (f) *ſin*, which had been made over to them by the other. This I take to be the true relation of a Sacrament to the *New Covenant*, and ſo I ſhall continue to do, till I come to be better enlightned in it. For which cauſe I ſhall only add, that as the conſent, we now ſpeak of, is in a Sacrament declar'd by both parties; ſo he, who adminiſters it, is in that caſe in the place of God, and declares his conſent to the Covenant; Becauſe doing what he doth by vertue of that Commiſſion (g), which empower'd the Apoſtles, and their Succeſſors to *Baptize* all, that

(c) Matt. 28. 19.
(d) Tit. 3. 5.
(e) Luk. 22. 20.
(f) Matt. 26. 28.
(g) Matt. 28. 19.

should offer themselves unto it, and made them the *dispensers* of that, and the other (*h*) *mysteries* of our Religion.

(*h*) 1 Cor. 4. 1.

The *fourth* and *last thing*, to which I affirm'd a Sacrament to relate, is the *body of Christ*, even that *mystical* one, which is made up by those, that believe in him, and adore him. Now to this *Body* it relates, in the *general*, as a *discriminative sign* of the profession of it, and by which the several members thereof may both know, and be known by one another, and accordingly joyn in such *acts*, as God exacts of their body. For because God, who made men sociable Creatures, was willing they should worship him in society also, as for other reasons, so to make him an apt return (*i*) of praise for that blessing, which they receiv'd by God's disposing them to a sociable life; And because (as St. *Augustine* (*k*) speaks) *men cannot be associated into any Religious body*, nor indeed into any other, *but by a community of visible signs, and Sacraments* (of which, beside the thus confederating of men of all Reli-

(*i*) Expl. of the fourth Com. Part 1.

(*k*) *Aug. contr. Faust. Manichæ. li.* 19. *c.* 11.

Religions, we have a proof in men's general inability to judge of the profeſſion of their Aſſociates by any other way, than by ſuch outward notes, or characters) therefore, I ſay, God, and Chriſt, when they meant to erect a Chriſtian body, gave it ſuch ſigns, and notes alſo; Partly, to give beginning to it, and the ſeveral members of it, and partly, to continue them in thoſe joynt Offices, and ſervices, which they requir'd the performance of. The former whereof is done by the Sacrament of Baptiſm, the latter by the Sacrament of the Euchariſt. And how much theſe two Sacraments conferr toward the keeping up the profeſſion of Chriſtianity, will appear, on the one hand, from thoſe miſerable *Chriſtians*, who live under the *Turks*, and, on the other, from thoſe much more miſerable perſons the *Quakers*, who live among our ſelves. For as the poor *Greeks*, by reaſon of the *ignorance of their Prieſts*, and the *unintelligibleneſs*, as well as the *hudling up* of their *Liturgies*, have little other means beſide thoſe Sacraments, and

other ſuch ſymbolical rites to keep up the profeſſion of Chriſtianity among them (which yet, it may be, they are more tenacious of, than thoſe who are better inſtructed among us, would be under the like circumſtances) ſo thoſe much more miſerable perſons the *Quakers*, having thrown off the viſible ſigns of Chriſtianity, have upon the matter come to throw off Chriſtianity it ſelf, and whatſoever it obligeth us either to believe, or do in order to our obtaining the ſalvation promiſed by it. If they have made a ſhift to rear, or keep up ſo much as their own *Profeſſion*, it was owing in the beginning to that *Quaking*, which gave denomination to them, and, ſince that, to their *affected looks*, and *habits*, and behaviour, which are, if I may ſo ſpeak, the *viſible ſigns*, or *Sacraments* thereof. And, if once they fall off from theſe, as we ſee they begin to do, we ſhall ſoon find their profeſſion to fail together with it, and to be buried in the ſame grave. But to return to that more *ſacred body*, of which I but now entreated, and to which as I affirm'd

a Sacrament to have the relation of a general badge, or diſcriminative ſign of the profeſſion of it, ſo I muſt alſo to be a *means* of *bringing particular men into it*, or *continuing them in the communion of it*: It being *into this body* (as was before obſerv'd out of St. *Paul*) that all Chriſtians are *baptiz'd*, and ſo therefore firſt entred by that Sacrament; And in that body too that they continue by the receipt of the other Sacrament, becauſe it is, by their *partaking of the bread* of it, that the ſame St. *Paul* affirms, that they become that *one Bread*, and *Body*. For being members of that body by the former Sacrament, they cannot otherwiſe be ſaid to make it up by the partaking of the latter, than as that may ſerve to keep them within the communion of it.

III. An account being thus given of the *things*, to which a Sacrament relates, together with the *nature of that relation* it beareth to them; It remains that I enquire what the *foundation* of that relation is, which is the only thing farther to be known toward

toward the diſcovery of the properties of a Sacrament. For the underſtanding whereof we are to know, that as the relation, whereof we ſpeak, is of different ſorts, to wit the relation of a *ſign*, of a *means of conveyance*, and of a *pledge* (for ſuch I have ſhewn a Sacrament to be, as to that grace of God, to which it principally referrs) ſo it may have different foundations, agreeably to that diverſity, which I have ſaid to be in the nature of the relation. For, as a *ſign*, it is founded in part in the *reſemblance*, which it bears to the things ſignified by it (for ſo all ſigns of *repreſentation* are) and in part alſo in the *Inſtitution* of him, whoſe the Sacrament is: Becauſe as the former reſemblance is not ſo apparent, as by its own force to have ſuggeſted to us the things ſignified by it, ſo it could not without his inſtitution, whoſe the Sacrament is, have laid any obligation upon us to conſider it in that relation of it. I ſay not the ſame concerning that relation of a Sacrament, whereby it becomes a *means of conveying* to us the Divine

Divine grace, or *a pledge to assure us thereof*: Because each of these relations is founded *simply*, and *only* in the *Institution* of him, whose the Sacrament is. For a Sacrament having no natural aptitude either to convey the Divine Grace to us, or to assure us, that if we receive that Sacrament, we shall receive the other also; It must consequently (if it become such a *means*, or *pledge*) become so by the Institution of him, by whom it is suggested to us. But because I have said nothing hitherto, *whose* that *Institution* is, by vertue of which a Sacrament puts on the forementioned relations; And because it is alike certain, that whosoever's that Institution is, yet it produceth not those effects by its own immediate force, but by the intervention of some Act, or Acts of those, whom he hath intrusted with the dispensation of them; Therefore, to satisfie our selves yet farther concerning the *foundation* of those relations, enquire we in the next place *whose* that Institution is, upon which they are founded, and *how* that Institution ought

ought to be *appli'd* to enable it to produce them.

As concerning the *Perſon*, whoſe that Inſtitution is, little needs to be ſaid, conſidering what the Scripture hath ſaid concerning Baptiſm, and the Lord's Supper, which are the only clear Sacraments of our Religion. For Baptiſm, and the Lord's Supper being apparently *Chriſt*'s own Inſtitutions, and ſo declared to be by thoſe Scriptures, which give an account of them; Whatſoever hath the relation of a Sacrament, muſt have him for its *Author*, or (as our Church hath expreſſed it) be *ordained* by him. Beſides, a Sacrament, as ſuch, being both a conveyer, and a pledge of *Grace*, the diſpenſation whereof is entruſted unto Chriſt (*l*), either that, which pretends to be a Sacrament, muſt have him for its Author, or it muſt not be look'd upon under that relation. And thus far we find even thoſe of *Rome* to go, becauſe not only repreſenting *all the Sacraments of the New Law* as *inſtituted by Jeſus Chriſt* our Lord, but pronouncing an Anathema

(*l*) Eph. 4, 7. —— 15, 16.

nathema alſo (*m*) upon thoſe, that ſhall deny it.

(*m*) Conc. Trid. Seſſ. 7. Can. 1. de Sacr.

It being therefore not at all to be doubted, *whoſe* that *Inſtitution* is, upon which the relations of a Sacrament are founded; enquire we in the next place *how* that inſtitution ought to be appli'd, to enable it to produce thoſe relations. Which muſt be firſt by a declaration of the purport thereof, and ſecondly by doing thoſe things to the elements, which either the *general tenour of the Chriſtian Religion*, or the *particular precepts of the Inſtitution* prompt us to the *performance* of. That I repreſent the *firſt* of theſe as one of thoſe things, which makes the Inſtitution of Chriſt to become effectual toward the producing of the former relations, or (as it is more commonly expreſſed) toward the conſecration of thoſe Elements, which are to put them on, is partly upon the account of the neceſſity of ſuch a declaration, and partly upon the account of the Commands of him, by whom the Sacraments were inſtituted. For a Sacrament being not ſo clear a repreſentation of

that,

that, of which it is ſo, as by its own force to ſuggeſt it to the minds of thoſe, for whom it was intended; Being much leſs ſo clear a repreſentation of it, as to invite thoſe to reflect upon it, who are either ſlow of underſtanding, or otherwiſe indiſpoſed to contemplate it, ſuch as are the generality of men; It cannot but be thought neceſſary, even upon that account, to call in the aſſiſtance of ſuch words, as may declare to thoſe, that are concern'd, for what ends, and purpoſes it was appointed. Otherwiſe men may either look upon the whole as a purely civil action, or (if the Perſon that adminiſters it, and other ſuch like circumſtances prompt them to conceive of it, as a religious one) yet fancy to themſelves ſuch ends, and purpoſes, as are either different from, or contrary to the true intendment of it. Agreeable hereto is the command of the Author of our reſpective Sacraments, as is evident from what he enjoyns concerning Baptiſm and the Lord's Supper; His own expreſs injunction concerning the former being,

ing, that his Diſciples ſhould baptize men *in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt*, which could not be done without a *rehearſal* of thoſe *names* at leaſt; As concerning the latter, that they ſhould do what they had ſeen, and heard him do, as oft as that Sacrament was adminiſtred, and therefore alſo make a verbal declaration concerning it. For though that be not ſo clear from thoſe words of our Saviour, *Do this in remembrance of me*, I mean as they lie in St. *Luke* (n); yet will it be found to be ſo, if we take in the Comment of St. *Paul* (o), where he gives a like account of the Inſtitution of it. For repreſenting what was then ſaid, and done as a preſcription for future (p) Sacraments, as well as for that of Chriſt's *own immediate conſecration*; Repreſenting it moreover as ſuch upon the account of what Chriſt then enjoyn'd concerning their doing the ſame things in remembrance of him, he muſt conſequently (becauſe he brings in our Saviour making a *verbal* declaration concerning the purport of that Sacra-

(n) Luk. 22. 19.

(o) 1 Cor. 11, 20. &c.

(p) — 23. 25, 26.

Sacrament, and ſubjoyns the former injunction of it) be thought to repreſent it as our Saviour's mind, that they, who conſecrated that Sacrament, ſhould uſe the ſame declarations concerning it. But beſide a *declaration of the purport of the Inſtitution*, and which the Church hath generally kept ſo cloſe to, as to make that declaration by the very *words* (q) *of the Inſtitution*, it is no doubt alike neceſſary, if not more toward the producing of the former relations, to do thoſe things to the Elements, which either the general tenour of Chriſtianity, or the particular precepts of the Inſtitution prompt us to the performance of. For if Prayer be ſo generally neceſſary toward the procuring of any favour, that it becomes ſuch as to the obtaining of common, and ordinary ones; If it be ſo far neceſſary toward them, as to become ſuch even to the bleſſing of our ordinary repaſt (r), though that be not without a natural aptitude to nouriſh, and ſuſtain us; How much more may we think it to be neceſſary, as to the making of thoſe

(q) Conſtit. Apoſt. li. 8. c. 12.

(r) 1. Tim. 4. 4. 5.

thoſe elements, which are in no diſpoſition to it, to become the conveyers of the Divine Grace to thoſe, who are to partake of them. But ſo the perpetual practice of the Church will oblige us to believe, and act, as to the one, and other Sacrament, of our Religion. For though there be not any particular injunction concerning conſecrating the water of Baptiſm, and I ſuppoſe becauſe the neceſſity thereof was ſufficiently known by what the Scripture hath ſaid concerning the general neceſſity thereof; Yet as we find *Ananias* admoniſhing St. *Paul* (ſ) *to waſh away his ſins* by Baptiſm *calling upon the name of the Lord*, and which, no doubt, becauſe he Baptiz'd him, the ſame *Ananias* went before him in; As we find farther by *Juſtin Martyr* (t), that they, who were to be baptiz'd, were admoniſhed to *faſt, and pray, the Brethren praying, and faſting for, and with them* (for theſe are ſufficient proofs, that ſome ſort of *Prayers* did alway precede it) ſo we find by thoſe, who have given a more particular account of the Of-

(ſ) Act. 22. 16.

(t) Apolog. 2.

fices of the Church, that the Prieſt did pray particularly (*u*), that *God would look down from Heaven, and ſanctifie that water, wherein they were to be Baptized by him.* The caſe is yet more plain as to the Sacrament of the Euchariſt, as ſhall be made appear, when I come to entreat purpoſely concerning it. And therefore I ſhall only add, that as the Inſtitution of our reſpective Sacraments cannot obtain its effect, without doing thoſe things to the Elements thereof, which the general tenour of Chriſtianity obligeth us to perform, ſo much leſs without the doing of thoſe things, which *the particular* precepts of the Inſtitution oblige to the practice of. For the force of a Sacrament depending more immediately upon the Inſtitution of him, whoſe the Sacrament is, it muſt conſequently, as to the application of that Inſtitution, depend more upon the doing of thoſe things, which the particular precepts of the Inſtitution oblige to the practice of, than upon thoſe, which the more general, and therefore remoter precepts of Chriſtianity oblige unto.

(*u*) Conſtit. Apoſt. lib. 7. c. 43. Dionyſ. Areop. Eccl. Hier. c. 2.

The

The conſequence whereof, as to the Euchariſt, will be, among other things, a neceſſity of giving God thanks for thoſe gracious boons, which that Sacrament was intended both to convey, and aſſure. The reſult of the premiſes is this; A Sacrament, as ſuch, is a relative thing, it is ſo in an eſpecial manner as to the Divine Grace, as which it ſignifies, and conveyes, and aſſures. But as thoſe relations thereof are *founded*, rather in the inſtitution of the Author of it, than in the vertue of thoſe elements, in which they are ſubjected; ſo in *that* again, not ſo much as delivered by our Saviour, as applied to the elements by a declaration of the purport of it, and by ſuch other Acts as the general tenour of Chriſtianity, or the particular precepts of the Inſtitution oblige thoſe, who are the diſpenſers of a Sacrament, to do to the elements thereof.

I do not at all found the relations of a Sacrament in ſuch Act, or Acts, as are requir'd of thoſe, that partake of it; Yea though without ſuch Act,

or Acts, they cannot partake of the Graces of it: Partly, becauſe a Sacrament being an inſtitution of Chriſt, it muſt rather depend upon his appointment, and the facts of thoſe, who act in his behalf, than upon the diſpoſition of ſuch as are to partake of it; And partly, becauſe a Sacrament, though not conveying, or aſſuring the Divine Grace to any, but the worthy Receivers of it, yet is as really and truly a Sacrament to thoſe, who are otherwiſe diſpos'd, as it is to the moſt worthy ones. As is evident among other things from St. *Paul*'s affirming the unworthy receiver of the Euchariſt to be *guilty of the Body* (w), *and Blood of Chriſt*, and again to *eat, and drink Damnation to himſelf, for not diſcerning* (x) *the Lord's Body*. For how come they to be *guilty of the Body, and Blood of Chriſt* by the meer reception of the elements, if thoſe elements be not even to them a *Sacrament* of his Body, and Blood? Or how faulty for not *diſcerning* in them the Lord's Body, and Blood, if thoſe elements, which they receive, have not the

(w) 1 Cor. 11. 27.

(x) ——— 29.

the relation of a *Sacrament* to them? Neither will it avail to ſay, that ſuch perſons may become *guilty* of *Chriſt*'s *Body, and Blood*, becauſe receiving not as they ought, thoſe elements, which are the *ſigns* of them. For as it will follow from thence, that thoſe elements, which they receive, are ſo far, at leaſt, a Sacrament of Chriſt's Body, and Blood, I mean as that is a ſign of them; ſo there is reaſon enough to believe from the way the Apoſtle takes to prove the forementiond charge, that thoſe elements were as really a Sacrament to them in all other reſpects, as they were in the notion of a *ſign*: Becauſe he founds that charge of his upon Chriſt's making thoſe elements the Sacrament of his Body, and Blood (*y*), and which therefore he muſt ſuppoſe them to be as much to them, as they are to any perſon whatſoever. That which I conceive hath occaſion'd men to be otherwiſe opinionated, was their conceiving of a Sacrament, not as a means *fitted by Chriſt* to convey, or aſſure the Divine Grace, and which accordingly,

(*y*) ------27.

where it is duly receiv'd, actually doth ſo; but as a thing, which is not only in a diſpoſition to it, but, where it is really a Sacrament, *infallibly* doth ſo to all, that partake of it. Which conceit, it may be, they were the more eaſily betray'd into by the Scriptures repreſenting it rather as a thing, which actually *ſanctifies*, and *ſaves*, than as a thing, which is only fitted for it. But as there might be ground enough for ſuch *expreſſions*, as thoſe, whether upon the account of the perſons, whom it is ſo ſaid to *ſanctifie, and ſave*, or upon the account of there being enough in a Sacrament to do it, where the parties, that partake of it, are duly qualified for it; ſo the Scripture hath ſometimes ſo qualified its own aſſertions by making the due diſpoſition of the party receiving it to be neceſſary to procure the other, that we cannot but look upon a Sacrament, rather as a thing fitted to produce ſuch effects, than as actually, and infallibly producing them. And indeed, as there is therefore but reaſon to conceive ſo of a Sacrament, even as a

means

means fitted by God, and Chriſt to produce thoſe effects, which are attributed to it; ſo, by thus ſtating it, a way is opened to diſtinguiſh between the *Efficacy of a Sacrament*, and of the *Receiver's faith*, and accordingly to aſſign each its proper intereſt in the procuring of thoſe Graces, which are attributed to it. For by this means we ſhall make a *Sacrament*, with that bleſſing of God, which attends it, to be the ſole conferrer, and aſſurer of thoſe Graces, which is but agreeable to it as an *inſtrument in the hand of God*; And the *faith* of the party receiving only the receiver, and applier of the other, which is as agreeable to that *hand* of man. For as, if a Sacrament be a means fitted by God for the forementioned purpoſes, the conferring, and aſſuring of thoſe Graces will belong to it, and that bleſſing of God, which doth accompany it; ſo nothing therefore will remain to the faith of the party receiving, but to receive, and apply what the other doth ſo conferr, and aſſure. I ſay, ſecondly, that as by this means a due

diſtinction will be made between the *efficacy* of a *Sacrament*, and *that* of the receiver's *faith*; ſo a way will be opened in like manner (without detracting, in the leaſt, from the *efficacy* of a *Sacrament*) to return an anſwer to what is advanc'd, on the one hand, for the *opus operatum* of all Sacraments, and, on the other, for making the *elements* of the *Euchariſt* to be *that very Body*, and *Blood* of Chriſt, which it was intended to convey. For whereas it is pretended (z), in the behalf of the former, and accordingly alledged as a proof of it, that the efficacy of a Sacrament depends upon the inſtitution of God, and not upon the dignity of him, that adminiſters it, or the faith of the receiver; I anſwer, that that is indeed true, and agreeable enough to our ſtating the nature of a Sacrament, but of no force at all to ſhew that *opus operatum*, whereof they ſpeak. For as, if a Sacrament be a means fitted by Chriſt for the conferring of his Graces, the conferring of thoſe Graces will belong wholly to it, and that bleſſing of God, which goes along with it;

(z) *Vid. Chemnit. Exam. Conc. Trid. Part. 2. in Can. 7, 8. de Sacram.*

ſo

ſo if it be a means rather fitted for the conferring of them, than that, which actually, and infallibly doth, any otherwiſe than as it is receiv'd, and appli'd, as Chriſtianity admoniſheth, there will be a like neceſſity of the *opus operantis*, even of that faith, and repentance, which are requir'd in order to the reception of them. And it may not unfitly be illuſtrated by the natural quality of thoſe elements, which are by Chriſt made uſe of for the Sacrament of his own Body, and Blood. For as of what force ſoever thoſe elements may be either to ſuſtain, or refreſh us, yet they cannot be expected to do either, unleſs they be receiv'd, and well digeſted; ſo how well fitted ſoever by the Inſtitution of God the ſame elements may be to conferr to higher purpoſes, yet there is as little reaſon to expect they ſhould, unleſs they be applied by us, as he, who ſo inſtituted them, hath admoniſh'd. In like manner, whereas it is pretended * from unworthy receivers of the *Euchariſt* being *guilty of the Body and Blood of Chriſt*, that therefore thoſe elements, which they

* *Eſth. Com. in locum.*

they do ſo receive, are *really* that Body, and Blood, and accordingly are actually partook of; That alſo is taken away by what we have before ſaid concerning the Euchariſts being a means fitted by Chriſt for the conveying of them: Becauſe, if it be only ſuch, there will be place for that guilt, yea though that Body, and Blood of Chriſt be not in it, nor receiv'd by thoſe, who are partakers of the other; In as much as he offers a ſufficient affront to them, who receives thoſe elements unworthily, which were by God, and Chriſt intended, and fitted for the conveying of them. I may not omit to add, if it were only for that hint, which the former obſervation affords us, that we ſhall, by thus ſtating the nature of a Sacrament, imprint alſo in the minds of men a juſt apprehenſion of that guilt, which ariſeth from an unworthy reception of it For as, if it be fitted by Chriſt to convey, or aſſure the Divine Grace, it muſt make thoſe, that partake unworthily thereof, guilty of an equal affront to that Grace, which it is ſo fitted to convey, or aſ-

ſure;

ſure; ſo if it be not ſo fitted, the crime will ſtill be the leſs, by how much the leſs relation it hath to that Grace, which is pretended to be violated by the unworthy reception of it. In fine, by ſtating the nature of a Sacrament, as is before deſcrib'd, we ſhall make our account thereof agree ſo much the more exactly with that, which our own Catechiſm preſents us withall; That, though it repreſent a Sacrament as a means of Grace, and a pledge of it, yet repreſenting it not as *actually*, and infallibly ſuch, but only as ordained by God to be ſo, and which accordingly, in the event, may prove ſuch, or not, as it ſhall be found to be receiv'd, and appli'd.

For the applying of all which to the buſineſs, that is now before us, even the making up of that *Definition*, which we have been hitherto making way to, I cannot but admoniſh, that a Sacrament referring to ſo many ſeveral things, and referring to them alſo with ſo many different relations, it will be hard, or rather impoſſible to furniſh out any one de-

finition

finition of it, which ſhall with any exactneſs anſwer to its ſeveral properties. For conſidering a Sacrament with reſpect to the *Divine Grace*, and to which of all others it ſeems more eſpecially to relate; ſo it may, and ought to be defin'd to be ſuch an outward, and viſible ſign thereof, as is moreover ordained, and fitted by Chriſt to be a means of conveying it to us, and a pledge to aſſure us thereof. Conſidering it again, with relation to *our own piety*, and to which no doubt it was alſo intended to adminiſter; ſo it will be ſuch an outward and viſible ſign thereof, as is by Chriſt ordained, and fitted for us to make a declaration of it by, and an obligation to the continuance of it. Conſidering it Thirdly, with relation to that *New Covenant*, by which the Divine Grace, and our piety are ty'd together; ſo it will be ſuch an outward, and viſible ſign as is ordained, and fitted by the ſame Chriſt, for God, and Man to declare their conſent unto it by, and either firſt enter into that Covenant by it, or to renew it. Conſidering it laſtly, with reſpect

reſpect to *thoſe*, who are joyn'd together in the ſame Covenant, and ſo connected to Chriſt, and to one another; ſo it will be ſuch an outward, and viſible ſign, as is by Chriſt ordained, and fitted for a general badge of their common profeſſion, and a means of bringing particular men into their Society, or continuing them in the Communion of it. Only if any man deſire a more ſimple definition of it, and which though it will not anſwer to all the properties thereof, yet will at leaſt anſwer the more eſpecial ones; ſo it may not inconveniently be defin'd to be ſuch an outward, and viſible ſign, as is ordained and fitted by Chriſt to ſignifie, and convey, and aſſure the Divine Grace to us, and, on our part, to declare the duty we owe to God, and Chriſt, and oblige our ſelves to the continual practice of it.

PART III.

A farther Explication of the Nature of a Sacrament, with a resolution of several Questions belonging thereunto, or depending more immediately upon it.

The Contents.

The Nature of a Sacrament brought again under consideration, and enquiry accordingly made concerning that inward and Spiritual Grace, *to which it relates, the* manner *of its* relation *to it, and the* foundation *of that relation. This last more particularly insisted upon, and as it was before resolv'd to be the* Institution

Inſtitution of Chriſt, *ſo a more ample account given thereupon of that Inſtitution of his, and of thoſe* Commands, *and* Promiſes, *whereof it doth conſiſt. Thoſe* Commands *again conſidered with reference to the ſacramental* Elements, *before they put on that relation, or after they are inveſted with it. The* former *whereof are ſhewn in the general to enjoyn the* ſetting them a part *for that purpoſe, or* Conſecrating *them, and enquiry thereupon made* by whom *they ought to be ſet apart, and whether their* intention, *or* good diſpoſition *be requiſite to give force unto it: The latter the Conſecrators diſpenſing them as the Inſtitutor thereof hath preſcrib'd, and the peoples receiving them from them, with the Manner of it. Upon occaſion whereof Enquiry is made, concerning the neceſſity of Sacraments, and in what ſort, or degree they ought to be accounted ſuch. A like particular account given of the* Promiſes *of the Inſtitution, which are ſhewn in* the general *to aſſure Chriſt's making what is done both by the*

Conſe-

Conſecrators, and Receivers to be available for thoſe ends, for which they were enjoyn'd; More particularly *his converting that into a Sacrament, which is by the former ſet apart to be ſo (and which how it is done is, upon that account, enquir'd into) and, where the receivers are rightly diſpos'd, acompanying the diſpenſation of the Sacramental Elements with the Diſpenſation of the Divine Graces. An application of the whole to the buſineſs in hand, and Enquiry accordingly made, how the former* Commands, *and* Promiſes *contribute toward the* Founding *a Sacramental* Relation, *and how alſo to the efficacy of the elements, after that Relation is produced in them.*

NOW though from what hath been ſaid it be competently evident, what the *Nature* of a Sacrament is, and we thereby at liberty to go on to other conſiderations concerning it; Yet becauſe there are ſome things in it, which may require a farther Explication, and others, which depend more

Queſtion. How many parts are there in a Sacrament?

Anſwer. Two; the outward viſible ſign, and the inward Spiritual Grace.

more immediately upon the due underſtanding of it, I purpoſe to go over the definition of it again, or, at leaſt, over ſo much of it, as may require a farther Explication, or Help toward the clearing of the other.

In the general I obſerve, that as it appears by our own Catechiſm, and the definition before given, that a Sacrament conſiſts of an outward, and viſible Sign, and an inward Spiritual Grace; ſo that more general notion of it ſtands confirm'd to us by the ſuffrage of *Irenæus* (*a*), though by him delivered under another form: He repreſenting the Euchariſt, even after the Invocation of God hath paſt upon it, as conſiſting of two things, to wit, an *Earthly*, and a *Heavenly* one. And I ſhall only add, that they ſeem not to be over mindful of it, who make the Sign, or *Earthly* part of the Euchariſt to vaniſh, as ſoon as the thing ſignified by it, or the *Heavenly* one approacheth: A Sign in the common underſtanding of it, together with that *relation* whereby it becomes ſo, and thoſe accidents, wherein it is immediately founded,

(*a*) Adv. hær. l. 4. c. 34.

founded, connoting the *Subject* of them both, and therefore not with reaſon to be predicated of that Sacrament, which hath no ſuch *Subject* to uphold them.

But becauſe there is otherwiſe no great Controverſie concerning the general notion of a Sacrament, nor yet ſo far, concerning that particular one I before gave, as to its being an outward, and viſible Sign of that, of which it is a Sacrament; Therefore paſs we both from the one, and the other, to that *Heavenly* thing, to which it relates, the *manner* of its relation to it, and the foundation of that relation.

Now as the firſt of theſe hath been before defin'd to be an *inward*, and *Spiritual Grace*, as that again declar'd to be ſuch a Grace, or favour of God, as conduceth in an eſpecial manner to the welfare of our inward Man, or Spirit; ſo I muſt now add, for the farther Explication of it, that it is moreover ſuch a Grace, as conduceth *immediately* to the welfare of it: Whether as purifying the ſoul from the filth of ſin, and introducing the contrary

affections, or as delivering it from that guilt, which the filth of ſin had brought upon it. A notion, which ſtands confirm'd to us, not only by the Doctrine of our own *Catechiſm*, but by the account the *Scripture* gives us both of Baptiſm and the Euchariſt, and the confeſſions of the *Romaniſts* themſelves. Witneſs for the *firſt*, its declaring the *inward, and Spiritual Grace* of Baptiſm to be a *death unto ſin*, and a *new birth unto Righteouſneſs*, as the *inward grace* of the Euchariſt to be the *Body*, and *Blood of Chriſt*, and by which (as it afterward follows) our Souls are *ſtrengthened*, and *refreſhed*, as our bodies are by the outward elements thereof; Witneſs, for the *ſecond*, its repreſenting Baptiſm as a thing, which *ſanctifies* (*b*), and *ſaves* (*c*), and both that (*d*), and the Euchariſt (*e*) as things, which tend to the remiſſion of Sins; Witneſs, for the *third*, their great Schoolman *Aquinas* (*f*) repreſenting a Sacrament as a ſign of ſuch a Sacred thing, as procures the *ſanctification* of us. Which is the rather to be noted, becauſe of the uſe it will hereafter

(*b*) Eph. 5. 26.
(*c*) 1 Pet. 3. 21.
(*d*) Act. 2. 38.
(*e*) Matt. 26. 28.
(*f*) Sum. 3. Part. quæſt. 60. Art. 2.

hereafter be of toward the determining the *Number* of thoſe things, which are to be accounted of as *Sacraments* of our Religion.

Concerning the *relation* a Sacrament bears to the object of it, and particularly to that Grace, to which it eſpecially referrs, I have nothing to add, and ſhall not therefore bring it again under conſideration. I ſhall only obſerve, from what hath been before ſaid concerning it, that it is an *inſtrument* of Grace, as well as a *pledge* of it, that it is a *moral* inſtrument thereof, and not a *phyſical* one, that it is *ſuch* a moral inſtrument thereof, as is rather *apt* to convey, or produce it, than that which *actually*, and *infallibly* doth; The actual conveying of that Grace depending upon the due diſpoſition of the party receiving it, and who (as St. *Paul* ſpeaks) if he be not rightly qualified for it, will rather reap *Damnation* by it, than either the Divine Graces, or the rewards of them. Which things I have this ſecond time made mention of, not becauſe they were not before ſufficiently clear'd, but becauſe they

lay diſperſedly in my former account of this *relation*, and ſo would have been leſs uſeful toward the forming a diſtinct conception of it.

That, which will eſpecially require our ſecond thoughts, is the *foundation* of that, and other the relations of a Sacrament; The which as I have affirm'd *in the general* to be the inſtitution of Chriſt, ſo the farther conſideration of that Inſtitution will both lead us to a more diſtinct knowledge of the nature of a Sacrament, and inform us concerning the *neceſſity*, and *efficacy* thereof. Now as there are two things, which that Inſtitution doth manifeſtly import, that is to ſay a *Command*, and a *Promiſe*; ſo that *Command* again reſpects the *elements* of a Sacrament, either as being *to put on* that relation, or as actually *inveſted with it*. In the former of theſe regards it commands the ſetting them apart for that purpoſe, but more eſpecially (becauſe that is the principal deſign of a Sacrament) for their becoming a means of conveying the Divine Graces to us. Which, as was before obſerv'd,

it

it either preſcribes particular rules for, or remits men for them to the general precepts of Chriſtianity, ſo far as they are applicable thereto. And I ſhall only add (becauſe thoſe rules were before declar'd) that, to make the elements put on the relation of a Sacrament, there is a neceſſity of applying that part of the Inſtitution to them by the execution of thoſe Commands, which it enjoyns: Becauſe the ſetting them apart for that purpoſe is, by the Inſtitution it ſelf, put into the hands of men. But of what men, and how qualified, I have not as yet declar'd, and ſhall therefore now ſet my ſelf to enquire.

And here in the firſt place it is eaſie to ſee, by what is deliver'd in the general concerning the *power of remitting ſins*, or in particular concerning the *power of Baptiſm*, that the Separation or Conſecration of the elements is the proper work of the Miniſters of the Goſpel, and ought accordingly to be left to them to perform: Becauſe as both the one, and the other were by Chriſt committed to his Apoſtles, ſo none can there-

fore pretend to the power of either, but thoſe who deriv'd it from them, which none but the Miniſters of the Goſpel have. It is no leſs eaſie to ſee ſecondly, that as the Separation, or Conſecration of the elements is the proper work of the Miniſters of the Goſpel, even by the Inſtitution of Chriſt; ſo it cannot therefore, ordinarily at leaſt, be attempted without ſin by others, becauſe a deviation from his Inſtitution. And thus far all, who acknowledge a Miniſterial Function, are at an accord in this particular, and the farther proſecution thereof no way neceſſary to be intended. I ſay therefore thirdly, that as the Separation, or Conſecration of the elements cannot, ordinarily at leaſt, be attempted without ſin by other than the Miniſters of the Goſpel; ſo there is reaſon enough to believe, even from thence, that thoſe elements cannot ordinarily have the relation of a Sacrament by any others Conſecration, than theirs. For beſide that the Promiſe of Chriſt is not to be ſuppos'd to extend any farther, than thoſe Commands, to which it is annexed,

annexed, are obſerv'd; Neither can we think he will vouchſafe his benediction to that Action, which without any neceſſity at all varies from his own Inſtitution: This being to encourage men to go againſt his own Inſtitution, which no wiſe Inſtitutour can be ſuppos'd to give way to. All therefore, that can be ſuppos'd to admit of a diſpute in this affair, is, whether in extraordinary Caſes (and where a lawful Miniſter cannot be had) other Perſons may take upon them to Conſecrate, and Adminiſter it; And whether, if they do ſo, what they do is ſo far valid, as to make that, which they pretend to Conſecrate, and Adminiſter, to have the relation of a Sacrament. But as it would be conſider'd whether it were not equally adviſable for ſuch Perſons to let alone altogether the Conſecration, and Adminiſtration thereof; Becauſe Chriſt may as well ſupply to men the want of the Sacraments themſelves, as the defects of thoſe, who pretend to Conſecrate, and Adminiſter them: As it would be conſidered farther, whether it were

were not much more advisable to do so, because he, who omits the Consecration, or Administration of a Sacrament, that belongs not properly to him, is certainly guilty of a far less error, than he who arrogates to himself that, which doth not appear to appertain unto him; so if a Sacrament so Consecrated, or Administred, be either lawful, or valid (as I will not be very forward to deny it, considering the Authorities (*b*) it hath for it) it must become so by the either express, or tacit allowance of those, to whom the Administration of it is regularly committed. For the Institutor of a Sacrament, and by whom alone it can become such, having put into their hands the preparation of it, I see not how any thing can become such, which is not either mediately, or immediately set apart by their Authority, and Ministry.

(*b*) Vid. Tert. de Bapt. c. 7. & quæ annotavit Hookerus noster Eccl. Pol. l. 5. Sect. 62.

It appearing from the Premises, to whom the separation, or Consecration of the elements doth belong, and so far therefore also the producing of a sacramental relation in them; Enquire

quire we in the next place how thoſe perſons ought to be farther qualified, to enable them to make that Separation, or Conſecration; Which I ſhall not ſtick to affirm to be ſimply, and only by keeping, as to the outward work, to the Inſtitution of our Saviour. For though much more may be requir'd of them, yea undoubtedly is, to make that Act of theirs available to their own welfare, and acceptance; Even the intending what they are about, not only with a preſent mind, but with a ſound, and religious one; Yet cannot the like be ſuppoſed to be requir'd, to make that Act of theirs available toward the Conſecrating of thoſe elements into a Sacrament: Partly becauſe if ſuch an intention were requir'd in thoſe, that Conſecrate, no man could have any tolerable aſſurance of his receiving a valid Sacrament, becauſe having no ſuch aſſurance of their intention; And partly, becauſe that Act of theirs is a *Miniſterial Act*, and muſt not therefore depend for its force, upon the *perſonal* intentions or qualifications of thoſe, that exerciſe it, but upon that

that *Authority*, from which it proceeds, and upon its ſerving the *ends*, and *intentions* of thoſe principal Agents, to which it is appointed to miniſter. Which ends, and intentions if it can ſerve in this affair by an outward conformity to the rules of Chriſt's Inſtitution, nothing more can be ſuppos'd to be requir'd either of it, or thoſe, that exerciſe it, to give it that force, whereof we ſpeak. That therefore would in the next place be enquir'd into, which accordingly I will now ſet my ſelf to do.

For the clearing whereof we are firſt to know, that as of old the Prieſts under the Law were *ordained* * *by God for men in things pertaining to God*, partly to *offer up to him*, in their names, *Gifts, and Sacrifices for ſin*, and partly to *convey from God to them graces*, and *benefits*; ſo we are, in like manner, to conceive of the Prieſts under the Goſpel, as being not only the Miniſters of God, and Chriſt, but

*Heb. 1. 5. & Philo de ſpecial. leg Βέλεται δ' αὐτὸν ὁ νόμος μεί ζονος μεμοιρᾶσθαι φύσεως, ἢ καθ' ἄνθρωπον, ἵνα διὰ μέσου πρὸς ἀνθρώπους μὲν ἱλάσκωνται θεὸν, θεὸς δὲ τὰς χάριτας ὀρέγῃ, καὶ χορηγῇ.

but appointed too, on the one hand, to diſpenſe their *myſteries* (k), and *graces* to the Church, and, on the other hand, to offer up the *Churches Prayers*, and *Services* to them. From whence as it will follow, that thoſe *principal* Agents, to which they miniſter, are *God*, and *Chriſt*, on the one hand, and Chriſts *Church*, and *People* under the other; ſo that the end of the *former* is to convey, by their means, their own graces, and bleſſings, of the *latter* to offer up thoſe Prayers, and other Services, which are due from the Church to them. Thoſe therefore being the *Principal* Agents, to which the Evangelical Prieſthood miniſters, and thoſe their reſpective ends, and intentions; the next thing to be enquir'd into is, which of thoſe *Principal* Agents it is, to which the Evangelical Prieſthood miniſters in thoſe acts which reſpect the Conſecration of a Sacrament. Which I ſhall not ſtick to affirm, from what was before ſaid concerning thoſe Acts, to be the Church, and People of God. For that, which the Miniſter doth toward the Conſecration of a Sacrament, being

(k) 1 Cor. 4. 1.

ing principally, at leaſt, the offering up of Prayers and Praiſes, he muſt conſequently (becauſe thoſe are the duties of the Church to God, and Chriſt) be thought to miniſter to the *Church* in them, and ſo have that for his *Principal* Agent. From whence as it will follow thirdly, that the end to which he is to ſerve, is the offering up, in the behalf of the Church, ſuch Prayers, and Praiſes, as are by the Inſtitution of Chriſt impos'd upon it (becauſe that is the end of the Church in all ſuch Adminiſtrations); ſo he ſhall ſufficiently ſerve that end, who ſhall only rehearſe ſuch Prayers and Praiſes, whereever, or whatſoever his intention be: Becauſe the Church may as well offer up its Prayers, and Praiſes by the voice of him, that intends them not, as by the voice of him, that doth. And I have been the more particular in the Explication of this affair, partly to make it farther evident, that the validity of a Sacrament depends not upon the intention of the Miniſter, but much more to ſhew from thence, that thoſe acts, which are done by him toward the Conſe-

cration

cration of the Sacramental elements, do not, by the either abſence, or perverſeneſs of his intention, ceaſe to be religious, and ſo incapable of inducing God to conſider of them, or give force unto them: Becauſe as thoſe Acts are rather the Churches, than his (the Miniſter being in this affair but the Inſtrument thereof) ſo his want of Intention, and Devotion, may be abundantly ſupply'd by the others, and thoſe Acts thereby become both Religious and valid.

From that Command, which reſpects the elements, before they put on the relation of a Sacrament, paſs we on to that Command, which conſiders them as inveſted with it; Which again we ſhall find to have a double reference. For it may either concern *thoſe*, in *ſpecial*, who have ſo ſet apart, or Conſecrated them, or both *them* (if they are alſo to be the receivers of them) and *all others*, for whoſe ſanctification they are intended. Upon the *former* of theſe it enjoyns the diſpenſing, or beſtowing of what they have ſo Conſecrated, as that too in ſuch a manner, and with ſuch ſolemnities,

nities, as the Inſtitutor thereof hath preſcrib'd. It enjoyns upon them farther, for their own ſouls health, to diſpenſe them with a ſutable intention, and devotion of ſoul; As without which what they do cannot otherwiſe be profitable to themſelves. But it doth not ſo injoyn that intention, and devotion, that what they diſpenſe, ſhall, for the want thereof, be in like manner unprofitable to others: Becauſe, as we already ſuppoſe the elements to have put on the relation of a Sacrament, and ſo far therefore to be in a capacity to profit thoſe, to whom they are diſpens'd; ſo it is Chriſt, and not the Miniſter, who muſt diſpenſe the Graces of the Sacrament, and the effect of that Sacrament therefore depend, not upon the Miniſter's intention, and purpoſe, but upon the intention, and purpoſe of Chriſt, whoſe Inſtrument, and Miniſter he is. As will appear yet more clearly, when I come to conſider the *Promiſes* of the Inſtitution, the ſecond thing, whereof I affirmed it to conſiſt. Only, as that Command of it, which I am now entreating of,

doth

doth as well reſpect thoſe, for whoſe ſanctification the Sacraments were intended, as thoſe who are the Conſecraters, and Diſpenſers of them; ſo I muſt therefore admoniſh firſt of all, that as that part of the Inſtitution of Chriſt enjoyns upon his Miniſters the diſpenſation of the Sacraments, ſo it muſt conſequently enjoyn the receipt, or uſe of them by all that are capable thereof, as without which the former injunction would be vain. I ſay, ſecondly, that as it enjoyns upon all, that are capable thereof, the receipt, or uſe of the Sacraments; ſo it enjoyns their receipt, or uſe of them under the relation of Sacraments, and particularly (becauſe that is the principal relation of a Sacrament) as a means appointed by Chriſt for the conveying of the Divine Graces. Which is ſo true as to thoſe Sacraments, which are the only clear, and undoubted ones, and by which, if there be any ſuch, the other are to be judg'd, that men are expreſly call'd upon to be *Baptiz'd* (k) *for the remiſſion of ſins*, and as expreſly admoniſh'd by our Saviour to take the elements of the Euchariſt (*l*), as that *Body which was given*

(*k*) Act. 2. 38.

(*l*) Matt. 26. 26, *&c.* Luk. 22. 19.

for them, and as that *Blood, which was ſhed for them, and others, for the* ſame remiſſion of ſins. From whence as it will follow, that thoſe Sacraments are of *neceſſary uſe*, as which both the *one*, and the *other injunction* oblige us to believe; ſo they are alſo *ſo neceſſary* by vertue of the former, that *they cannot be neglected* without ſin, and by the latter, if not the former, that men *cannot hope for the graces of them*, where thoſe Sacraments are in like manner *neglected*. For beſide that every neglect of a Command is, as ſuch, a ſin againſt the impoſer of it, and muſt conſequently not only deſpoil us of his favour, but expoſe us alſo to his Wrath, and Vengeance; Beſide that that neglect muſt be yet more ſinful, and dangerous, which is a neglect of ſuch a Command, as is enjoyn'd for the Subjects profit; He, who commands this, or that particular for ſuch, or ſuch an end, muſt thereby be preſum'd to declare, that he will not give it in any other way, than that, which is preſcribed by him: Becauſe otherwiſe a gap would be open to the Violation of his Authority, which every wiſe Lawgiver muſt

muſt be ſuppos'd to provide againſt. Neither will it avail to ſay, that there are other *means*, beſide Sacraments, for the attaining of the Divine Graces, and ſuch as God hath promis'd to reward with the beſtowing of them; Of which nature are our attendance to the *word*, and Prayer. For as it doth not appear, that theſe are any where repreſented as ſufficent of themſelves for that purpoſe, and therefore the Divine Graces not to be expected by them alone; ſo they can however be no farther repreſented as ſuch, than as made uſe of by men out of a due regard to his Authority, and wiſdom, by whom they are impoſed on them: Which cannot be ſuppos'd to be there, where any one preſcribed mean is neglected, becauſe the ſame Authority, and Wiſdom will lead to the obſervation of it. As little will it avail to ſay, that the Divine Graces have been ſometime beſtow'd without them, and the Sacraments therefore not to be accounted as neceſſary to the attaining of them. For as the queſtion is not now, Whether Sacraments are ſo neceſſary, that the graces thereof can, in no caſe, be hop'd for without them, but

whether they can be hoped for, where the Sacraments are neglected; ſo that they are *ſo far* neceſſary will need no other proof, than the enjoyning of Baptiſm to thoſe, who may ſeem, if any, to have attain'd the graces thereof without it. For ſo we find St. *Peter* to have done as to *Cornelius* (m), and his company; Yea though *Cornelius* had before his Preaching, receiv'd a Divine approbation of his *Prayers*, and *Alms*, and, after that, that *gift of the Holy Ghoſt*, for the procuring whereof we find Baptiſm to have been eſpecially (*n*) ordain'd. For well may we look upon that Sacrament as ſo far neceſſary to obtain the Divine Graces, the uſe whereof was commanded even to thoſe men, who had in a great meaſure before attain'd them. The only thing, that ſeems to me to admit of any doubt, is whether Sacraments be ſo far neceſſary, that the Divine Graces cannot be had without them, or at leaſt cannot with any aſſurance be expected by us. But as the ſingle example of the Thief upon the Croſs (to ſay nothing now of that of *Cornelius*) may ſuffice to perſwade, that

(m) Act. 10. 48.

(n) Act. 2. 38.

no

no Sacrament is ſo neceſſary, but that the Graces thereof may be had without it: As the benignity of the Divine nature, and thoſe Graces God hath ſometime given even to unbaptized perſons, may ſerve in like manner to perſwade men, that if that, or any other Sacrament be wanting without their fault, it ſhall be otherwiſe ſupplied to them; So I cannot forbear to ſay, that ſuch perſons have not the ſame Aſſurance with that, which Baptized perſons have. Partly, becauſe they have no promiſe to bottom their aſſurance on, and partly, becauſe God, who may annex what conditions he pleaſeth to his own favours, hath made thoſe Sacraments, whereof we ſpeak, the ſtanding means of obtaining them. I will conclude what I have to ſay concerning that part of the Inſtitution, which enjoyns the receipt, or uſe of the Sacraments, when I have admoniſhed in the third place, that it requires our coming to it with certain *previous qualifications* in order to our receiving the benefit thereof. Which is ſo notorious as to Baptiſm, and the Lord's Supper, and will hereafter be ſo largely inſiſted on, that I

ſhall content my ſelf with the bare mention of it. All that I at preſent aim at, is to give a general account of what it enjoyns, and which having now in ſome meaſure done, I ſhall proceed to conſider of what it *promiſeth*, which is the *ſecond* thing whereof I affirmed the Inſtitution of a Sacrament to conſiſt.

For the clearing whereof we are *firſt* to know, that though thoſe *Promiſes*, whereof we ſpeak, are not always ſo expreſs, as its *Commands* muſt be acknowledg'd to have been; Yet will it not be difficult for us to evince the being of *ſuch* Promiſes, nor, after that, to ſhew *what things* it makes a promiſe of. For ſuppoſing, as we now may (becauſe I have heretofore evinced it) that the Inſtitution of Chriſt enjoyns the Adminiſtration, and uſe of the Sacraments for the bringing about thoſe gracious purpoſes, which they have no natural aptneſs to produce, and we muſt alſo ſuppoſe it to make a promiſe of Chriſt's making them effectual for thoſe purpoſes, for which they were ſo enjoyned by him. Becauſe otherwiſe thoſe Commands of his would give hope of ſuch things, as were not likely to accrue by the obſer-

obſervation of them, and ſo (which is not to be ſuppos'd of the Commands of Chriſt) prove deluſory ones. Only as he, who inſtituted thoſe Sacraments for our benefit, cannot well be thought to omit any thing, which may encourage our expectation of it; ſo we find both him, and his Apoſtles ſometime to make expreſs promiſes of thoſe things, which the Sacraments were intended to convey. For thus after our Saviour had commanded the Adminiſtration of the Sacrament of Baptiſm to all, whom they could diſpoſe to the reception of it, the more to encourage them to intend the doing of it, he makes a promiſe of being (*o*) with them in it, and conſequently that their miniſtry, at leaſt, ſhould not fail of its intended effect in the Conſecration, and Adminiſtration of it. In like manner, after St. *Peter* had call'd upon thoſe to be Baptiz'd, whom God had ſtirred up by his precedent Preaching, to enquire after the means of Salvation; He doth not only inſinuate their obtaining remiſſion of ſins by it, by calling upon them to be Baptiz'd in or-

(*o*) Matt. 28. 19, 20.

der to it, but assure them also in expres
(p) Act. 2.38. terms (p), which he could not have done without a promise from Christ, that, if they were so Baptiz'd, they should receive the *gift of the Holy Ghost*.

It appearing from the Premises, that the Institution of Christ is not without its promises, and such too, as are sometime deliver'd in expres terms; Enquire we in the next place what those promises are, or rather what things they make a promise of. Which, in the *general*, will be found to be, Christ's making what is done both by Minister, and People, in obedience to his Commands, to be available to those ends, for which they were enjoyn'd. For neither otherwise could he have said, that he would be with the *former* in those Acts of theirs, and much less could St. *Peter* have assur'd to the latter the receiving of those Graces, which Baptism was intended to convey. But from thence it will follow more particularly, that the Institution of Christ makes a promise to the Minister, that he will convert that into a Sacrament, which is by him set apart to be so, and where the

the party, that is to receive it, is duly qualified for it, accompany his Diſpenſation of it with the Diſpenſation of the Divine Graces; To ſuch of the People again, as receive the Sacrament as they ought, that they ſhall receive together with it, thoſe Graces which it was intended to convey: Thoſe being the ends, for which the former Acts were enjoyn'd, and the Promiſe of Chriſt therefore ſuppoſed to aſſure, that, if thoſe Acts be perform'd, they ſhall become available for them. It will follow laſtly, that, as there is a promiſe of the things before remembred, anſwerably to the ſeveral Acts, which the Commanding part of the Inſtitution enjoyns; ſo that Promiſe being the Promiſe of him, who hath power enough to accompliſh it, and is of too much fidelity, and truth not to fulfill, what he may, it is as little to be doubted, but what he hath ſo promis'd he will not fail to accompliſh, as often as what he enjoyns is perform'd. Which laſt particular I have the rather remark'd, becauſe as the Commands of the Inſtitution cannot make way

fo-

for the bleſſings of a Sacrament, till they come to be fulfill'd by thoſe, on whom they are impos'd; ſo neither can the promiſes thereof help us to them, till they come to be executed, and appli'd by him, whoſe thoſe Promiſes are: A Promiſe, (becauſe importing only a will to conferr a favour) requiring the reducing of that will to Act, in order to the availableneſs thereof.

An account being thus given of that *Inſtitution* of Chriſt, which I have ſaid to be the *foundation* of the relation of a Sacrament, it will not be difficult to ſhew firſt, how *that*, and *each part* thereof contribute to the founding of it. For as that Inſtitution of Chriſt may be conſider'd under a double notion, to wit either as *ſimply ſuch*, or as *executed, and appli'd*; ſo the Inſtitution of Chriſt, in the *former* notion of it, is the more *remote* foundation of it; in the *latter* the more *near*, and immediate. For it being by vertue of Chriſt's Command, as ſuch, that the elements come to be ſet apart by men for the purpoſe of a Sacrament, and by vertue

of

of his own Promiſe, that he himſelf gives them the relation of one; That Inſtitution, which is made up of them, muſt, as ſuch, be thought a *remote* foundation of it, becauſe the foundation of thoſe Acts, which are done by men, and Chriſt toward the producing of it. Again, it being more immediately by what is done by men, that the elements come to be ſo ſet apart, and by what is done, on the other ſide by Chriſt, that they come to have the relation of a Sacrament, the more *near*, and immediate foundation of it muſt be the ſame Inſtitution not conſider'd as ſuch, but as executed, and appli'd by thoſe, to whom it appertains. From whence as it will follow, that the Inſtitution of Chriſt, and the ſeveral parts thereof contribute to the founding of this relation by that obedience, which is paid to its commands, and by that completion, which is given to its promiſes, becauſe it is by thoſe means that they are executed, and appli'd; ſo nothing more therefore can be requir'd toward the clearing of it, than to ſhew at once what thoſe Commands and Promiſes

miſes import, becauſe that will let us know what obedience is due to the one, and what completion, or fulfilling to the other.

Of the *Commands* of the Inſtitution I have already ſufficiently entreated, and ſhall therefore need only briefly to recapitulate what I have ſaid concerning them. Which, ſo far, as concerns our preſent purpoſe, may be done by ſaying, that they enjoyn in the *general* the Miniſters ſetting apart the elements in order to their becoming a Sacrament, more *particularly* by imploring the bleſſing of God, and Chriſt upon them, or (as the Church hath us'd to expreſs it) the *ſanctification* of them. Which Commands, as they tend rather to prepare the elements to be a Sacrament, than to produce that relation in them (for he, who begs of another the doing of this, or that particular, ſhews the doing of that thing not to belong unto himſelf) ſo will make the Miniſter's compliance with, and execution of them to contribute no farther to the founding of that relation, than as that is, by the Inſtitution of Chriſt, to make way for

ſome

ſome other Act, or Acts, whereby that relation is to be produc'd.

From the *Commands* of the Inſtitution therefore, and that obedience which is due to them, paſs we to the Promiſes thereof, and of which alſo I have before given no contemptible account. For which cauſe I ſhall only obſerve here, that there is, among thoſe Promiſes, a Promiſe from Chriſt to the Miniſter, that he will be with him in his miniſtration, and therefore alſo make what he doth, available for thoſe ends, for which it was enjoyn'd; That he will conſequently (becauſe that is the end of his miniſtration in the Conſecration of a Sacrament) make thoſe elements to be a Sacrament, which were by the Miniſter ſet apart to be ſo; But by what way, and means, as I have not as yet taken upon me to ſhew, ſo I know not whether I ought to be over poſitive in defining. I ſhall only repreſent as a thing, which ſeems moſt probable to me, That as God *ſanctifies* our ordinary repaſt by his own word (*q*), even by that word of *command*, by which he *made* the creatures to be (*r*) at firſt, and by which he

(*q*) 1 Tim. 4. 5.

(*r*) Gen. 1. 3. &c.

(ſ) Heb. 1.3. he doth as yet *uphold* (ſ) them, ſo when the elements of a Sacrament are before prepar'd by Prayer, and ſuch other means as Chriſt himſelf hath preſcrib'd, the ſame God, or rather *Chriſt*, by his appointment, paſſeth his *word of power* upon them, and thereby commands them, not to become actually the conveyers of his Grace (for that requires *another* word of power, or rather his accompanying the Diſpenſation of them with the Diſpenſation of his Grace) but to be in a readineſs to be ſo. By which means (as was before ſaid) they are fitted for that gracious purpoſe, and accordingly, if they prove not effectual for it, it is not, becauſe *they* were not before ordained and fitted for it, but becauſe the *perſons*, to whom thoſe Sacramental elements are diſpens'd, being not duly prepar'd for ſuch a favour, He, who commanded the Sacramental elements to be in a readineſs for it, doth not make uſe of them for it, nor accompany the Diſpenſation of them with the Diſpenſation of his Grace. This I take to be that *Act*, whereby the Inſtitutor of the Chriſtian

an Sacraments produceth in the elements thereof that Sacramental relation, whereof we ſpeak; But as *whatever* the Act be, by which that relation is produc'd, moſt certain it is that it cannot be any Act of man, ſo it is evident from thence, and from the promiſes of the Inſtitution, that it muſt be ſome *Act* of *Chriſt* in purſuance of them, and which whilſt he doth ſo fulfill, he gives birth to that Sacramental relation, which the Act, or Acts of the Miniſter did only make way for, as that too by the ſole force of Chriſt's Commands.

The elements being thus inveſted with the relation of a Sacrament, and ſo fitted, *in particular*, to convey the Divine Graces; It remains that the Miniſter diſpenſe them to Gods People in that way and manner, which he hath preſcrib'd, and that they accordingly receive them with thoſe qualifications, which are by the ſame Chriſt required of them. As without the *former* whereof there can be no hope of the Miniſters approving himſelf unto Chriſt, nor can the people, without *both*, expect to reap that benefit by

by them, which they were ſo fitted to convey. For the validity, and efficacy of Sacraments depending upon the good will of him, that inſtituted them, and not upon any vertue of their own, or the power of him that conſecrates them, neither can men expect any benefit thereby, where there is not a due compliance with his *Laws*, by whom they were ſo inſtituted, and ordain'd. But as if thoſe Laws be compli'd with, there can be no doubt of a happy iſſue, conſidering the Promiſes of Chriſt to the due Adminiſtration, and Reception of them; ſo that is enough to ſhew the *efficacy* thereof, where they are ſo adminiſtred, and receiv'd: There being no doubt of the efficacy of thoſe things, which have the Promiſes of Chriſt to aſſure them, becauſe no doubt at all of his fulfilling thoſe Promiſes, and ſo giving efficacy to the other. And I ſhall only add, that as what is done by the Miniſter toward the producing of a Sacramental relation, doth rather make way for it, than actually produce it; (this being the proper work of the Inſtitutor of a Sacrament in purſuance of his own Promiſes:)

miſes:) So the like is to be ſaid, as to the efficacy of the elements, after that relation is produced in them. For though thoſe elements become not effectual for the ends, for which they were appointed, unleſs they be both diſpenſed, and received as they ought; yet doth that diſpenſation, and reception rather make way for, than give them their reſpective efficacy; It being *God* (*t*), or rather *Chriſt*, by his appointment (and not either the Miniſter, or our ſelves) *which ſaveth us by the waſhing of regeneration, and the renewing of the Holy Ghoſt*, and the ſame Chriſt (*u*), who *ſanctifieth, and cleanſeth his Church, by the waſhing of water through the word.* Which will conſequently oblige us to look upon God, and Chriſt as the Authors of the efficacy of Sacraments, as well as of the Sacraments themſelves, and accordingly depend upon them for it, and return them thanks, when we have obtained it.

(*t*) Tit. 3. 5.

(*u*) Eph. 5. 26.

PART IV.

Of the *Jewish* Sacraments, and the *Number* of the Christian.

The Contents.

The Doctrine of the Sacraments *drawn down to* particulars, *and enquiry first made concerning the* Jewish Sacraments, *and then concerning the* Christian *ones. As to the* former *whereof is shewn* first, *that there were indeed* such *Sacraments among them, and evidence made thereof, from their enjoying the same* saving Graces, *which our Sacraments pretend to convey, from their being furnished alike with* external symbols *to convey them, and those* symbols

of God, and Christ's institution Secondly, *that those Sacraments of theirs were either the* extraordinary *ones they had in their passage from* Ægypt *to* Canaan, *as their* Baptism *in the Cloud, and in the Sea, and the* Eucharist *of Manna, and the water of the Rock, or the* ordinary *ones of* Circumcision, *and the* Passover; Thirdly, *That, though they were of the same general nature with the* Christian, *yet they differ'd from them, both as to the* manner *of their representing the Divine Graces, which was not so* clear, *and as to the* measure *of conveyance of them, which was not so* full, *as in the* Christian *Sacraments. Those* Christian *Sacraments, in the next place, brought under consideration, and evidence made of* Baptism, *and the Lord's Supper being the only* true, *and* proper *ones, or of* general necessity *to Salvation.*

THE *Nature* of a Sacrament being thus explain'd, and a *resolution* given of such *questions*, as *belong* to it, or *depend more immediately*

ately on it; It will be but time for us to deſcend to *Particular* ones, whether they be ſuch, as *preceded Chriſtianity*, and have the name of *Jewiſh*, or ſuch as were enjoyn'd by *it*, and may therefore more properly be termed *Chriſtian*. This only would be premis'd concerning the *former* Sacraments, that as we make them to have their birth before Chriſtianity, ſo we muſt therefore ſuppoſe them not to have had the Author *of it* for their *immediate Inſtitutor*, or, at leaſt, not as *God-Man*, which is the notion, wherein Chriſtianity conſiders him: He, to whom we give the title of *Chriſt*, becoming not God-Man, till long after the Inſtitution of thoſe Sacraments, and when indeed they were to be aboliſhed. Which will conſequently oblige us to conſider thoſe Sacraments (if there were any ſuch) rather as to thoſe purpoſes, for which we have affirm'd all Sacraments to have been ordain'd, than as to the immediate ordainer of them; Or, if alſo as to the immediate ordainer of them, yet not in the ſame capacity, wherein Chriſti-

anity considers him, but only as appointed by God to be so, when the time of his *Manifestation* should appear.

Now there are *three* things to be enquir'd into, as concerning *those* Sacraments, which are to be the subject of our present consideration; *First*, Whether there were *any such* among the *Jews*, *Secondly*, *What* those Sacraments were, Thirdly, *Wherein* they *differed* from *ours*.

I. That there were *such* things, as *Sacraments* among the *Jews*, will appear if these *three* things be consider'd; First, that the *same Graces*, which Sacraments profess to convey, prevail'd among them, as well as us, Secondly, That they had external *signs*, or *symbols* to convey those Graces to them, Thirdly, that those external signs, or symbols were *instituted* by *God*, and *Christ*.

Of the *first* of these I have given an account elsewhere *, and shall therefore referr my *Reader* thither, for his farther satisfaction. All I shall observe from thence is, that they partook of *Christ*, as well as we, and must therefore be suppos'd to have partaken of

* Expl. of the *Creed*, in the words, Our Lord.

of *his Graces*, which are the *Graces* all Sacraments were intended to convey.

But neither will there be leſs evidence concerning their being furniſh'd with certain *external ſigns*, to convey from God to them the foremention'd graces. For St. *Paul* †, where he affirms the *Jews* to have partaken of *Chriſt*, and his Graces, affirming in like manner that they did it, as by a *Baptiſm* on the one hand, ſo by *eating*, and *drinking* on the other, muſt conſequently be ſuppoſed to affirm, that they did it by the means of ſuch *ſymbols*, as *our* Sacraments are, and therefore alſo, that they were not unfurniſhed with them. Otherwiſe there could have been no place for giving the *former* means the name of *Baptiſm*, and much leſs for expreſſing the *latter* by the terms of *eating*, and *drinking*, or that *drinking* again by *drinking of that Rock, which followed them.* For as the foregoing mention of *Baptiſm*, which was one of the Chriſtian Sacraments, could not but incline the *Corinthians* to interpret what followed concerning the *Jews eating*, and *drinking*, of a *Sa-*

† 1 Cor. 10. 1, *&c.*

cramental one, eſpecially, when it is alſo affirm'd that they partook of Chriſt by it; ſo much more, when they ſaw the Apoſtle expreſſing that *drinking* by *drinking of that Rock, that followed them*, or rather of the *Water*, that flowed from it. For that being manifeſtly an alluſion to the *Water*, that flowed out of that Rock which was ſometime ſmitten † by *Moſes*, and by the drinking whereof the *Jews* were a long time ſuſtained; Neither could the *Corinthians* look upon that *Rock*, to which he alluded, as other than a *figure* of *Chriſt*; Nor therefore (conſidering their own Sacraments, as ſuch, which did alſo convey what they were figures of) as other, than ſuch a figure of Chriſt, as convey'd to the believing *Jews* Chriſt's *graces*, and *benefits*, which are the *ſpiritual waters*, that flow from him. *Two* things only there are, that may ſeem to prejudice this notion, and which therefore it may not be amiſs to conſider; *Firſt*, That the former Baptiſm is affirmed by St. *Paul* himſelf (*a*) to have been a *Baptiſm into Moſes*, and not into *Chriſt*, and his Graces; Secondly,

† Numb. 20. 11.

(*a*) 1 Cor. 10. 2.

Secondly, That what is affirm'd to have been to the *Jews ſpiritual meat*, and *drink*, was alſo their conſtant *temporal* one, and which therefore if we affirm to have been a Sacrament of Chriſt's graces, and benefits, muſt have made that Sacrament to have been as ordinary, as their Meals: Which how the *Jews* ſhould be always in a diſpoſition for, is not eaſie to imagine, and therefore as difficult to believe the Inſtitution of. As touching the former of theſe, even that *Baptiſm*'s being ſtil'd a *Baptiſm into Moſes*, it would not be eaſie to give an account, were it not that the Verſes, which follow, perſwade the deſign of the Apoſtle to have been to ſhew the *Jews* to have enjoyed the ſame Chriſtian Graces with our ſelves: Becauſe the *Baptizing into Moſes* ſeems moſt naturally to denote the baptizing into his Religion, as that may ſeem to have been *diſtinguiſh'd from*, and *oppos'd to* that of *Chriſt*; For ſo we know the *Oeconomy of Moſes* is generally taken by the Scriptures (*b*), and ought therefore, if there were nothing to hinder it,

(*b*) Joh. 1. 17.

it, to be alike interpreted here. But as the ſame is not to be ſaid, where the deſign of the Apoſtle is to ſhew, that the *Jews* partook with us of the ſame Graces, and Benefits; So nothing therefore can hinder our affixing a like ſenſe to the former Baptiſm, if we can give a tolerable account of its being ſaid to be a *Baptiſm into Moſes*. Which may be done by repreſenting it as a Baptiſm into that Oeconomy of our Redemption, which prevailed *under Moſes*, and of which he was the Miniſter of God unto the people, as well as of the Law. For thus the Baptiſm, which *John* adminiſtred, is repreſented as (*c*) *his* Baptiſm, even when it is intimated by our Saviour to have been a Baptiſm *from Heaven*, and ſo more the Baptiſm *of that*, than of the *other*. If therefore there lie any juſt exception againſt the being of theſe Jewiſh Sacraments, it muſt be upon the account of their ſuppoſed *Euchariſt*'s being alſo their *conſtant temporal* food, and which it is not eaſie to imagin they ſhould be always in a diſpoſition for, or therefore believe it was ever

(*c*) Matt. 21. 25.

ever intended by God as ſuch. But as it appears from the *Acts* of the Apoſtles (*d*), that our Euchariſt was almoſt of the ſame ordinary uſage at the firſt, which may take off in ſome meaſure from the force of that Objection; So nothing hinders us from believing, that that Meat, and Drink of the *Jews* being deſign'd for a temporal, as well as a Spiritual refreſhment, it might be ſometime, yea, for the moſt part, appointed only for the former (to wit, when the ſatisfying of their bodily neceſſities call'd for their regard) but at other times, though leſs frequently, appointed, and uſed for the latter, and accordingly accompanied with ſuch Prayers, and Praiſes, as were proper for that conſideration of it, and receiv'd with alike religious preparations, and diſpoſitions. For even the elements of our Euchariſt, though appointed by Chriſt as the Sacrament of his Body, and Blood, yet are not always us'd as ſuch; But only, when they are by God's Prieſts ſet apart for that purpoſe, and his ſpiritual *Benediction*, and *Grace* invoked on them.

(*d*) Act. 2.46.

I will

I will conclude what I have to ſay concerning the being of the former Sacraments, when I have added thereto their being ordained by *God*, and *Chriſt*, for the gracious purpoſes before remembred. Of the *former* whereof as we cannot reaſonably doubt, becauſe nothing leſs than a Divine Inſtitution could make them the conveyers of Chriſt's Graces; ſo as little of the *latter*, if we conſider what hath been elſewhere (*e*) ſaid concerning *Chriſt's* governing *even then*, and the Apoſtles exhorting the *Corinthians*, immediately after (*f*), not to *tempt Chriſt*, as the *Iſraelites* did, and were *deſtroy'd by Serpents* for it. For as it is not to be imagin'd, how the *Iſraelites* could *tempt Chriſt*, unleſs they had been even then under his conduct; So if *Chriſt* had the conduct of them, there is as little doubt of *his* being the Inſtitutor of their Sacraments, becauſe that was a conſiderable part of it.

(*e*) Expl. of the Creed, in the words, Our Lord.

(*f*) 1 Cor. 10. 9.

II. There being therefore no doubt of the *Being* of *Sacraments* among the *Jews*, which was the firſt thing we propoſed to conſider; Enquire we in the

the next place, *what* thoſe their Sacraments were, and which we ſhall find to be either *Extraordinary*, or *Ordinary*. *Extraordinary* thoſe which were juſt before recited, even their being baptized in the Cloud, and in the Sea, and their partaking of *Manna*, and of the Water of the Rock; *Manna* being no doubt the ſpiritual meat St. *Paul* ſpeaks of, both becauſe their only repaſt, and *the bread* (g), *that came down from Heaven*; As the water of the *Rock* their ſpiritual Drink, and ſo yet more plainly declared by him. And I have the rather given to them the name of *Extraordinary* Sacraments, becauſe as they had them only, during their paſſage through the Wilderneſs; ſo they had them too, when their ordinary Sacraments ceaſed, which is the proper ſeaſon for extraordinary ones. As will appear if we can ſhew (what I ſhall by and by endeavour) that *Circumciſion*, and the *Paſſover* were their ordinary ones; It being certain from the Book of *Joſhua* (h), that, from the time of the Iſraelites going out of *Ægypt*, till their coming to *Gilgal*, none of the Iſraelites

(g) Exod. 16. 4.

(h) Joſh. 5. 5.

lites were circumciſed, and as certain too from the ſame place (*i*), that they had not till then any *Paſsover*; That, as it is the firſt time wherein the obſervation of it is mention'd after their coming out of *Ægypt*, ſo being the firſt time alſo, wherein they were in a capacity to obſerve it, becauſe not till then furniſhed, or at leaſt not ordinarily, with that earthly Bread, wherewith their *Paſsover* was required to be obſerv'd.

(*i*) —— 10.

From thoſe their Extraordinary Sacraments therefore paſs we to their Ordinary ones, and which as I have already intimated to be *Circumciſion*, and the *Paſsover*, ſo I muſt now manifeſt to be ſo, but it muſt be by other Arguments, than are commonly alledged for it. For as for what is alledged from St. *Paul*'s repreſenting the *Circumciſion of Abraham* (k) as a *Seal of that righteouſneſs, which he had being yet uncircumciſed*, it ſeems to me to make nothing at all for it; Becauſe (as was before (*l*) ſhewn) rather intended to denote God's approbation of his particular Righteouſneſs,

(*k*) Rom. 4. 11.

(*l*) *Supra* Part II.

neſs, than any declaration of the nature of the thing it ſelf. But as therefore I cannot ſee, what can be argued from thence toward proving Circumciſion to have been a Sacrament; So I ſhall chuſe rather to evince it from the Inſtitution of it, as where, if any where, the deſign thereof is moſt clearly ſet down. Now the firſt thing obſervable from thence is, that Circumciſion was a *Sign*, as our Sacraments are, and *ſo far* therefore of the nature of them. For *this* (ſaith God) *ſhall be* a ſign, or *token* (m) *of the Covenant between me and you*; That is to ſay, as was before (*n*) expreſs'd, between *God* on the one hand, and *Abraham*, and *his Seed* on the other. It is alike obſervable, ſecondly, that as Circumciſion was a ſign, yea a ſign of that Covenant, which God then propos'd between himſelf, and the forementiond perſons; So it was ſuch a ſign too, as was alſo of the Eſſence of it, and till the paſſing whereof it was not to be look'd upon as ſtruck. Which I gather not only from its being ſtil'd a *Covenant* (*o*), as well as a ſign of it, yea more often

(m) Gen. 17. 10.

(n) —— 7.

(o) Gen. 17. 10.

a

a *Covenant*, than the other, but from God's affirming it to be *that* Covenant, which ought to be kept (*p*) between him, and them, and accordingly repreſenting the neglecters of it, as thoſe which had *broken* * *his Covenant*. From whence as it will follow, that it had a more intimate relation to the Covenant, than that of a bare ſign, or token; So it muſt be either that, which was to ſtrike the Covenant between them, and ſo make it actually ſuch as to thoſe perſons that receiv'd it, or one of thoſe things, which were to be obſerv'd after the Covenant was ſtruck between them, and for which it was enter'd into. But as it appears from thoſe words of God, which uſher in the mention of this Covenant, that the thing ſo agreed upon was a matter of much more weight, even their *walking before God, and being perfect*; So we are therefore in reaſon to reſolve Circumciſion to be that, which was to ſtrike the Covenant between God, and them, and make it actually ſuch, as to thoſe perſons that receiv'd it. From whence as it will

(*p*) Ibid.

* — 14.

will follow farther, becauſe ſtriking the Covenant between God, and them, that it enſur'd to thoſe, that receiv'd it, the future Bleſſings of it, and ſo might not unreaſonably be repreſented as a *Seal* or a *Pledge* of them; So that it put them into actual poſſeſſion of ſuch Bleſſings, as were preſently to be beſtow'd, if there were really any ſuch, and accordingly was no leſs a *means of conveying* them. Which will conſequently leave nothing more to enquire, than whether that Covenant aſſur'd the ſame Bleſſings with the Chriſtian, and whether any of thoſe Bleſſings were to be immediately beſtow'd by vertue of it. For if that Covenant aſſur'd the ſame Bleſſings with the Chriſtian, then had the ſign thereof relation to the ſame inward Graces with ours, and ſo far forth therefore agreed with them; And if any of thoſe Bleſſings were to be immediately beſtow'd, it was alſo a conveyer of them, and ſo yet more perfectly the ſame. Now that that Covenant, of which Circumciſion was a ſign, aſſur'd the ſame Bleſſings with the Chriſtian ſeems to me to be ſuffi-

ciently evident from it's being affirmed (*q*) to import, that *God would be a God to Abraham*, and *to his Seed after him.* For that implying at leaſt, that he would be as gracious to him, as he was before, and conſequently (becauſe God dealt with him ſo before) that he would *count his Faith to him for Righteouſneſs*, it muſt alſo be thought to import his aſſuring the ſame Bleſſings with the Chriſtian Covenant, becauſe that is the ſumm, and ſubſtance of them all. All therefore, that we have farther to ſhew, is, That ſome at leaſt of thoſe Bleſſings were, by vertue of the Covenant it ſelf, to be immediately beſtow'd on thoſe, who entred into it, which will be no hard matter to evince. For thus much at leaſt it muſt be thought to import, that if the party to be Circumciſed receiv'd his Circumciſion with that Faith, which God required of him, that Faith of his ſhould from that very inſtant be accounted to him for Righteouſneſs: Becauſe, the Covenant being ſo far perform'd on his part, there muſt enſue a like completion on the part of God, as which otherwiſe he

(*q*) —7.

he could not have been ſaid to be punctual to, nor approv'd himſelf a God to the party in Covenant with him. And tho we cannot make the like Inference upon the part of Children, becauſe there was nothing of Faith in them to procure them ſuch an Imputation; Yet in as much as they were admitted into the ſame Covenant with their believing Parents, and, as they could bring nothing more toward the procuring the Bleſſings of it, than their external Circumciſion, ſo they had nothing more required of them, It is but reaſonable to believe, that they receiv'd the ſame Benefits by it, and had their Circumciſion imputed to them for it. Such Evidence there is for Circumciſion's being a Sacrament, yea of the ſame general nature with the Chriſtian ones; And I no way doubt we ought to think the ſame of the Feaſt of the *Paſſover*, if not alſo of many of their other Sacrifices: Not, it may be, for any particular evidence there is from the Inſtitution of it, or them, but from the relation they bore to Chriſt's Sacrifice upon the Croſs, and the care it appears

God took to convey the Benefits of Chriſt's Sacrifice by thoſe extraordinary Sacraments, which he gave them in the Wilderneſs. For the Sacrifices before mention'd being equally ſigns of that of Chriſt, yea intended by God to remit men (†) to him; It is but reaſonable to believe, that God made the ſame uſe of them, and conveyed Chriſt, and his Benefits by them. Otherwiſe their condition in the Land of *Canaan* would have been worſe, than in the Wilderneſs, becauſe as ſoon as they entred that, their extraordinary Sacraments ceaſed.

(†) See Expl. of the *Creed*, in the word, Dead.

III. Only as it is not to be thought, that thoſe Sacraments, tho' the ſame in ſubſtance with ours, did yet agree with them in all other particulars, becauſe belonging to a Diſpenſation, which was manifeſtly inferiour to the Chriſtian; So there are two things, wherein they differ'd from ours, and by which they will appear to have fallen ſhort of them: Firſt, That they did not ſo clearly repreſent the things they were intended to ſignifie, Secondly, That they did not convey, what they ſo ſignified, in ſo ample a manner.

manner. For beſide that thoſe ſignifications of theirs were rather hinted, than plainly expreſſed, and much leſs ſo plainly expreſs'd, as the deſigns of the Chriſtian Sacraments; Thoſe ſignifications were not a little obſcur'd by the concomitancy of others, and which they were equally obliged to intend. For thus *Circumciſion*, becauſe a ſign of that Covenant, by which God did equally oblige himſelf to poſſeſs *Abraham*, and his natural Seed of the Land of *Canaan*, was a ſign of God's giving them that promiſed Land, as well as the righteouſneſs of Faith, and that Heavenly *Canaan*, which belonged to it. And thus too the Paſſover was a ſign of that People's Ægyptian Servitude, and God's delivering them from it, as well as Chriſt's delivering them from the ſlavery of Sin, and Satan, by the ſhedding of his Blood. By which means it is eaſie to ſee, that theſe latter, and more noble ſignifications of them muſt have been yet more obſcured to them, and ſo adminiſter leſs Spiritual Conſolation to them. This I take to be one ſignal difference be-

tween the Jewiſh Sacraments, and ours, and wherein therefore they muſt be thought to fall far ſhort of what we now enjoy. But that it is not the only material difference between them, will appear if we conſider the preference the Scripture gives to that Diſpenſation, under which we are, above that of *Moſes*, or *Abraham*; And that exuberance of Grace, which was poured out upon the embracers of the Chriſtian Diſpenſation, and of which we find no footſteps under the other. For that is enough to ſhew, that though the Jewiſh Sacraments convey'd the ſame Spiritual Benefits; yet they did not do it in that proportion, wherein the Chriſtian did, and ſo fell yet ſhorter of them. Which will not only oblige us to ſet ſo much the greater value upon *our own* Sacraments, but be the more curious in enquiring, what ought to be look'd upon as ſuch, which is that I am in the next place to intend.

For the reſolution whereof we are to know (what we need go no farther than our own Homilies *(x)* for the underſtanding) that the word *Sacrament*

(x) Hom. of Com. Pray. and Sacram.

crament may be taken either in a more *lax* and *general*, or in a more *ſtrict* and *particular* acceptation. If we take it in the former of theſe, ſo the number of the Chriſtian Sacraments will be found to be much greater, than even the Romaniſts themſelves have made it: Becauſe (as our Homily obſerves) *in a general acception the name of a Sacrament may*, and hath been *attributed to any thing, whereby an holy thing is ſignifi'd.* Whence it is (as the ſame *Homily* goes on) that *Ancient Writers have given that Name, not only to thoſe Five*, which have been added by the Papiſts, *but alſo to divers, and ſundry Ceremonies, as to Oyl, waſhing of Feet, and ſuch like.* But as the Queſtion between us, and the Papiſts, even in their own (*ſ*) way of ſtating it, is not what may in a more *lax*, and *general* ſenſe be look'd upon as Sacraments, but what are *ſtrictly*, and *properly* ſuch, ſo that Queſtion cannot better be voided, than by examining thoſe things, which pretend to that dignity by the account we have before given of the Nature of a Sacrament.

(*ſ*) *Conc. Trid. Seſſ. 7. can. 1.*

Of *Baptiſm*, and the *Lord's Supper* I ſhall ſay nothing at preſent, partly becauſe there is no Controverſie at all concerning their being truly, and properly Sacraments, and partly becauſe we have no other certain means of judging of the Nature of Sacraments, but by that, which is obſervable concerning *them*. Our buſineſs muſt therefore be to examin the other Five by them, and by what we have before obſerv'd, concerning the Nature of a Sacrament, from them.

To begin with *Confirmation*, becauſe the firſt Religious Rite after Baptiſm, and becauſe of all the *Five* beſt deſerving the name of a Sacrament: A Rite, which as our Church receives, and enjoyns, ſo the more ſober ſort of Proteſtants allow to have been an Inſtitution of the Apoſtles, and ſuch as is of ſignal uſe to thoſe, who were baptiz'd in their Infancy, by that examination, which is to precede it, and thoſe ſolemn Prayers, that do attend it. But as the thing it ſelf doth not appear to me to have been inſtituted by Chriſt, which, even by the Doctrine of the

the *Trent* Council (*t*) is made a Character of a Sacrament, ſo there is yet leſs appearance of its having any outward ſign, to which the bleſſings thereof may be ſuppoſed to have been annex'd, which is of the very Eſſence of a Sacrament: That, which was at firſt adminiſtred by a bare Impoſition of hands, and afterwards by the addition of the Chriſm, coming at length to be perform'd by the ſole ceremony of Unction, as the practice of the Greek, and Latine Church declares. Of which variation what account can be given, but that the Church it ſelf did at firſt look upon the Rites of Confirmation as arbitrary, and conſequently not of the ſame nature with the ſigns of Baptiſm, and the Lord's Supper. For whatever additions, or variations came afterwards to be made in theſe, the Water of the one, and the Bread, and Wine in the other were ever preſerved in them.

(t) *Ibid.*

The next ſuppoſed Sacrament is that of *Penance*, or rather (becauſe the form thereof is by themſelves (*u*) made to conſiſt in *Ego abſolvo*

(*u*) Conc. Trid. Seſſ. 14. c. 13.

ſolvo te, &c.) the Sacrament of Abſolution. An Inſtitution, which we willingly acknowledge to be an Inſtitution of Chriſt, and which our Church moreover confeſſeth (*w*) to have the promiſe of the forgiveneſs of ſins. But differs from a Sacrament in this, that it hath not that promiſe annexed, and tyed to the uſual viſible ſign thereof, even Impoſition of hands. For for the uſe of any ſuch viſible ſign in it we find no Command, and much leſs any declaration from Chriſt, that it ſhould not be available, unleſs it were convey'd by it, or made to depend upon the uſage of it.

(*w*) Hom. of Com. Pray. and Sacr.

But it may be much more may be ſaid for that, which they call the Sacrament of *Extreme Unction*, becauſe affirmed by the Council of *Trent* (*x*) to have been inſtituted by our *Lord*, and publiſhed to the World by St. *James*. And I no way doubt, that when our Saviour ſent forth his Diſciples by two, and two (*y*), he gave them power to *anoint ſick perſons*, as well as to caſt out unclean Spirits, and, it may be too, commanded them, for

(*x*) Seſſ. 14. can. 1.

(*y*) Mark 6. 7, &c.

for that time, to make uſe of that particular ceremony toward the healing of them. I as little doubt, for the mention that is made of it in St. *James* (z), that the ſame ceremony of Unction was continued in the Church, and perhaps preſcrib'd by other Apoſtles, as well as by him, to the Governours of the Church. But it doth not appear to me to have been intended by Chriſt for perpetual uſe, and much leſs for thoſe purpoſes, for which it is alledged. For if it were intended by Chriſt for perpetual uſe, how came the ſame Chriſt to promiſe to thoſe that believe, that if they only *laid hands* * *on* the ſick they ſhould recover? How came he to give his Apoſtles power to cure diſeaſes by the uſe of that *only ceremony*, as in the caſe of *Publius* †, by *taking infirm people by the hand* *, yea by their bare (a) word? This being to give encouragement to the neglect of his own Commands, if the ceremony of Unction were to be look'd upon as ſuch. Though granting that Ceremony to have been intended for perpetual uſe, what appearance

(z) James 5. 14.

* Mark 16. 18.

† Act. 28. 8.

*--------3. 5.

(a)----9. 34.

pearance is there of its having been intended for the purpoſes of a Sacrament, yea to procure, in an eſpecial manner, the forgiveneſs of ſins? For all that St. *Mark* ſays concerning the Apoſtles anointing with Oyl is, that they thereby healed (*b*) thoſe they did ſo anoint; Yea it is, if not the only, yet the principal thing St. *James* aſſures to thoſe, whom he enjoyn'd the uſe of it. As it appears by his uſhering it in as an application to be made to ſick perſons, his promiſing that that Prayer, which went along with it, ſhould ſave the ſick, and procure God's raiſing of them, in fine by his exhorting men to confeſs their faults one to another, that they might be healed. For theſe things ſhew plainly, that if the healing of ſick perſons was not the only thing intended, yet it was at leaſt the principal one. But ſo the Church it ſelf appears to have underſtood this ceremony, as is evident, among other things, from that Prayer, which did accompany it: That, as *Caſſander* (*c*) informs us, being, *I anoint thee with the holy Oyl in the name of the Father, Son,*

(*b*) Mark 6. 13.

(*c*) Conſult. de Artic. Rel. &c. ubi de Unctione infirm. agit.

Son, and Holy Ghoſt, imploring the mercy of that one Lord, and our God, that all the griefs and incommodities of thy body being driven away; there may be recovered in thee vertue [*or ſtrength*] *and health, that ſo being cured by the operation of this myſterie, and this Unction of the Sacred Oyl, and our prayer, through the vertue of the Sacred Trinity, thou mayeſt deſerve to receive this antient, yea more robuſt health through our Lord.* Which though it do not ſo directly oppoſe the εὐχέλαιον of the *Greeks*, becauſe deſign'd againſt *Corporal* (d), as well as *Spiritual* evils, yet doth perfectly overthrow the *Extreme Unction* of the Papiſts, as which is ſo far from deſigning the recovery of the ſick perſon, that it is not allow'd to be adminiſtred to any, who ſeem not perfectly deſperate. One only paſſage there is in St. *James*, which may ſeem to give this Ceremony of anointing a higher, and a far better deſign; even his affirming, that that prayer, which did accompany it, ſhould procure for the ſick perſon alſo, that *if he had committed ſins* (e), *they ſhould be forgiven him.* But beſide

(d) Se *Ricaut* Preſ. State of the Greek Church c. 12.

(e) James 5. 15.

ſide that St. *James* doth not attribute that forgiveneſs to the ceremony of Unction, but to the prayer that attended, or followed it; The deſign of the Elders viſitation of the Sick being no doubt to procure as well their Spiritual, as Corporal health, it is not unreaſonable to think, that that very Prayer, which they made over them, did not only aim at God's accompanying the former ceremony with the bleſſing, for which it was intended, but extend farther to the imploring for them all thoſe ſpiritual bleſſings, which they wanted, and particularly perfect remiſſion, and forgiveneſs. Which if it did, as is but reaſonable to believe, that Oyl cannot be thought to have had any intereſt in it, and much leſs to have been eſpecially intended as the Sacrament thereof. And indeed, as there are no footſteps in that Antiquity, which is truly primitive, of any ſuch Unction of ſick perſons in order to their ſpiritual welfare; As there is mention moreover in it of another kind of treatment, and particularly of the Elders of the Church

giving

giving unto thoſe, that were under penance the Sacrament of Chriſt's Body, and Blood, as their laſt, and neceſſary *Viaticum*; So I ſee not what neceſſity there is of any ſuch Sacrament as *Extreme Unction* to confer upon ſick perſons the remiſſion of ſins, or other ſuch like graces, as they may ſtand in need of; There being place, even in them, for the Abſolution of the Church, and the Sacrament of Chriſt's Body and Blood. In fine, ſo far is that *Unction*, of which St. *James* ſpeaks, from being any ſtanding Sacrament of our Religion, that it may ſeem to have been only an Appendage of that extraordinary gift of healing (*g*), which was ſometime depoſited in the Church, and which therefore was to ceaſe, when that, and other ſuch like operations vaniſhed. As appears in part from its being joyned in St. *Mark* (h) with the *caſting out of Devils*, but more from our Saviours ranking the *laying on of hands* upon the ſick (which was but another way of adminiſtring it) with (*i*) the ſame *caſting out of Devils*, *ſpeaking new tongues*, and *the*

Dionyſ. Alex. apud Euſeb. Eccl. Hiſt. li. 6. c. 44. item Conc. Nic. can. 13.

(*g*) 1 Cor. 12. 9.

(*h*) Mark 6. 13.

(*i*) Mark 16. 17, 18.

the taking up of Serpents. For if theſe be to be look'd upon as extraordinary gifts, there is equal reaſon to believe, the *anointing*, or laying on of hands upon the ſick to have been of the ſame order. Sure I am *Tertullian* (k) doth not only rank the gift of *healing*, even in his time, with the *caſting out of Devils*, but makes mention of one *Proculus* a Chriſtian adminiſtring this ſuppoſed Sacrament to *Severus* the Emperor, yea curing him by the Oyl of it.

(k) Tert. ad Scapulam cap. 4.

From *Extreme Unction* therefore paſs we to that, which they call the Sacrament of *Orders*, and which is not only affirm'd by the *Trent* Council to be a true (*l*), and proper Sacrament, but as certainly to confer (*m*) grace, as the moſt undoubted Sacraments do. It is not my purpoſe, nor was it ever the purpoſe of the Church of *England* to detract in the leaſt from the force of that, which they entitle the Sacrament of Orders. But that it hath not the nature of a true, and proper Sacrament, will appear in the firſt place from its not having by the Inſtitution of Chriſt any external

(l) Seſſ. 13. Can. 3.
(m) *Ib.* cap. 3.

external ſign, to which the grace thereof may be ſuppoſed to be annexed. For if it had, it muſt have been the external ſign, or ceremony of *breathing on* the perſons to be ordain'd; This being the only one, which our Saviour (*n*) made uſe of, when he conferr'd the power of *Order* upon his Apoſtles. But ſo far were the Apoſtles, or the ſucceeding Church from making uſe of that, that we find them, on the contrary, to have made uſe of Impoſition of Hands, yea to have entitled the *grace* of *Orders* (*o*) in a more eſpecial manner to it. Whether it were, that they took their pattern therein from the known uſage of the *Jews*, and which we find our Saviour himſelf to have followed in other inſtances, or (which I rather think) that they were directed to it by that ſpirit of God, which guided them in all their actions, and to whoſe guidance, and inſtruction our Saviour had left them after his being taken from them. Sure I am there are no footſteps of that external ſign in the firſt Inſtitution of it (as there was, in the Inſtitution of

(*n*) Joh. 20. 22.

(*o*) 1 Tim. 4. 14. 2 Tim. 1. 6.

Baptiſm, and the *Lord's Supper*, of their *proper* ones) nor any appearance from Scripture of any after command of Chriſt concerning it. But becauſe the external ſign of Ordination, though none of our Saviours Inſtitution, yet is confeſſed by our ſelves to have had a legitimate one; Therefore enquire we in the ſecond place, whether, after the manner of other Sacraments, it be a *means* of Grace, or (as the *Romaniſts* love to ſpeak) have the *power of conferring* it. A thing, which ſeems to them ſufficiently evident, not only from that form of words (*p*), wherewith by the preſcript of Chriſt it hath been always attended, even *receive ye the Holy Ghoſt*, but from St. *Paul*'s willing *Timothy* in one place (*q*) *not to neglect that gift*, or grace, *which was given* with it, and in another (*r*) to *ſtir up that gift*, or Grace *of God*, *which was in him by the laying on of his hands*. And thus much I willingly yield to the force of the forementiond Texts, that the *Holy Ghoſt* ever was, and ſtill is conferr'd upon thoſe men, who are rightly ordain'd by the Governours of the Church

(*p*) Joh. 20. 22.

(*q*) 1 Tim. 4. 14.

(*r*) 2 Tim. 1. 6.

Church. But in what meaſure, and to what purpoſes is the thing in queſtion between us, and particularly whether it is conferr'd, as to its *ſanctifying*, and *ſaving* Graces, which I have ſhewn elſewhere (*ſ*) to be the proper graces of a Sacrament. Now what is there in any, or all the forementioned Texts, to evince that, which they call the Sacrament of *Orders* to confer ſuch graces upon the perſon Ordain'd? If we enquire, as to the firſt of them (*t*), even that Text which makes Orders to exhibit the *Holy Ghoſt*, the utmoſt that can be inferr'd from thence is ſuch an exhibition of it, as may be requiſite for the party ordain'd to *remit*, or *retain ſins*, as for which (*u*), and which alone it is profeſſed to be beſtow'd. But ſo ſure the perſon ordain'd may be qualifi'd to do, without the ſanctifying graces of God's Spirit, even in the opinion of the *Tridentine* Fathers themſelves: It being their opinion (*w*), as well as ours (*x*), that the perſonal qualifications of the Miniſter do neither add to, nor detract from the force of the Sacraments they diſpenſe.

(*ſ*) Supra, Part 3.

(*t*) Joh. 20. 22.

(*u*) —— 23.

(*w*) Seſſ. 7. can. 12.

(*x*) Art. of Rel. 26.

But as therefore no ſuch ſanctifying graces can be ſuppos'd to be deſign'd, though we make the Text to import ſuch an exhibition of the Holy Ghoſt, as is requiſite for the remitting, or retaining of ſins; ſo much leſs, if nothing more were meant by *Receive ye the Holy Ghoſt*, than receive ye Authority from him ſo to do. Which that there was not is at leaſt probable from his referring them to another time (*y*) for the *other powers* of the Holy Ghoſt, yea bidding them not to expect them, till after his aſcenſion (*z*) into Heaven. For that ſuppoſeth them to have been as yet without thoſe powers of the Holy Ghoſt, and conſequently that Chriſt meant no more by *Receive ye the Holy Ghoſt*, than receive ye of his *Authority*, to whom the power of the Church is committed under me, as ye ſhall in due time of ſuch abilities, and gifts, as may fit you for the exerciſe thereof. And if that were the ſenſe, yea only ſenſe of thoſe words of Chriſt, which contain both the Exemplar, and Inſtitution of Ordination, I know not why we ſhould ſuppoſe that, which they call

(*y*) Act. 1.4. &c.

(*z*) Joh. 16.7.

call the Sacrament of Orders, to have a farther deſign in it ſelf, than to communicate a Ghoſtly Authority to thoſe, on whom it is beſtow'd. But let us ſuppoſe, that ſomething more was meant by theſe words, than *Receive ye a Ghoſtly Authority*, or, at leaſt, that it was the intention of our Saviour (becauſe of what we read * concerning *Timothy*) that ſomething more ſhould be afterwards intended by them, when no Apoſtolical *Pentecoſt* was to enſue, even the communicating of gifts and graces, as well as a Ghoſtly Authority. Yet even ſo it will not follow, that an exhibition of *Sanctifying*, and *Saving* Graces was intended, or that even *Timothy* receiv'd any ſuch graces by it. For who knows not that there are *Gratiæ gratis datæ*, as well as *Gratum facientes*, yea that the word † χάεισμα, is as often, if not more often the title of the former? Who knows not, that thoſe *Gratiæ gratis datæ* are more proper for the Miniſterial Function, than the other can be ſuppos'd to be, yea that they may avail for thoſe ſpiritual purpoſes, for which that Function was intended?

* 1 Tim. 4. 14. 2 Tim. 1. 16.

† Rom. 12. 6. 1 Cor. 1. 7. —— 12. 4. —— 9. —— 28. —— 30.

intended? In fine, who knows not, that God hath appointed other Sacraments for the conveying of his ſanctifying Graces, and by the participation of which therefore they might be more reaſonably expected? For theſe things being ſuppos'd, there will not only be no neceſſity of underſtanding St. *Paul* of the ſanctifying Graces of God's Spirit, but not ſo much as any probable reaſon for it. Though granting thirdly, that there were alſo *ſome ſanctifying Graces* attending it; Yet as we cannot for the reaſons before mention'd underſtand any other ſanctifying Graces, than what may ſerve more immediately for the diſcharge of the Miniſterial Function, ſuch as is a *holy Zeal* for the welfare of thoſe Souls, which are committed to thoſe that are of it, ſo we can much leſs (as our *Homily* * inſtructs us) expect *remiſſion of ſins* by it, which is the undoubted fruit of Baptiſm, and the Lord's Supper. From all which put together it is evident, that if judgment be to be made of Sacraments by Baptiſm, and the Lord's Supper, Orders will hardly paſs for one of them;

* Hom. of Com. Pray. and Sacram.

them; As which varies ſo much from them both in the External Sign, and in the Graces, which are ſignified by it.

One only Inſtitution remains of thoſe, which have the name of Sacraments, and which if they, who ſo entitled it, would underſtand only in a general ſenſe, they would not find our Church diſſenting from them, becauſe affirming (*a*) *God to have conſecrated the State of* Matrimony *into ſuch an excellent myſtery, that in it is ſignified, and repreſented the Spiritual Marriage, and Unity, that is betwixt Chriſt and his Church.* But to make it a *true*, and *proper* Sacrament of the Evangelical Law, as the Council of *Trent* (*b*) doth, is extremely unreaſonable, and neither hinted by St. *Paul* in that place (*c*), from whence they pretend to infer it, nor, any farther than a ſimple repreſentation reacheth, agreeable with thoſe things, which have the name of Sacraments either with us, or among themſelves. For neither was that, which they call a Sacrament of the Evangelical Law, inſtituted by Chriſt, but by God, nay

(*a*) The form of Solemn. of Matrim.

(*b*) Seſſ. 24. can. 1.

(*c*) Eph. 5. 25. *&c.*

St. *Paul* in the place before quoted founds all the Sacramentality thereof in thoſe paſſages(*d*) which are repreſented by *Moſes*(*e*), as declaring the Identity of Man, and Wife, and the neceſſity that ariſeth thereupon of their adhering to one another, even to the abandoning of all other relations for it. It hath no certain external ſign, as other Sacraments have, to confer that grace, which is ſuppoſed to belong to it; It hath no other promiſe of Grace belonging to it, than may be ſuppoſed to belong to any ſtate of life, which a Man ſhall ſet himſelf to, with a due reſpect to the Commands of God, and uſe with that care, and ſobriety, that becomes him. It hath much leſs any promiſe of the forgiveneſs of ſins, and an Univerſal Holineſs, as Baptiſm, and the Lord's Supper undoubtedly have. And if it hath not, nothing can oblige us to look upon it as a true, and proper Sacrament, or indeed but in the ſame degree, wherewith their other Sacraments are. For they, though not perfectly ſuch, have yet ſome more near reſemblance

(*d*)---30. 31.
(*e*) Gen. 2. 23, 24.

to

to thoſe, which they pretend to rival.

But becauſe it may be demanded, how, if there be but two ſtrict, and proper Sacraments, ſeveral other things ſhould come to have the ſame name, and honour, and particularly how the Church of *Rome* ſhould at length advance them to the number of *Seven* (this ſeeming to be ſome prejudice againſt our aſſerting only *two*) I anſwer firſt by reaſon of their general cognation with them, and which we know, in other things, to procure the ſame name to things, that are of a very different nature. Whence it is, that (as was before obſerv'd out of one of our own (*f*) *Homilies*) not only thoſe *five*, which we but now mention'd, have obtain'd the name of Sacraments, but whatſoever, in a manner, hath been made uſe of to ſignifie a holy thing. Which is ſo true, that *Tertullian* in one place (*g*) gives the name of Sacrament to *Dreams*, and *Viſions*, and in others (*h*) to *Parables*, and *Allegories*. For if even *Dreams*, and *Parables* come to have the name of Sacraments by

(*f*) Hom. of Com. Pray. and Sacram.

(*g*) De Animâ cap. 9.

(*h*) De pudic. c. 9. & adv. Marcion. li. 5. c. 4.

by reaſon of their repreſenting things of a higher nature; How much more ſuch Religious Inſtitutions, as were tranſacted by the ſame viſible ſolemnities as Baptiſm, and the Lord's Supper, as to be ſure the Inſtitutions before remembred were? For though, it may be, they had not the ceremonies now in uſe, or at leaſt had not that number of them, wherewith they are now encumber'd, yet wanted they not ſome, or other, which was of the ſame ſymbolical nature, and particularly *Impoſition of hands*. For that, as we learn from the Scripture, they made uſe of in *Confirmation* (i), in the gift of *healing* (k), *Orders* (l), and *Abſolution* (m); And that too, as we learn from *Grotius* (n), they made uſe of toward thoſe, who entered into Marriage, and ſtill do in the Eaſtern parts. But beſide that general, and external cognation, which is between Sacraments, and ſacramentals (for ſo I ſhall for the future entitle thoſe things, which are not ſtrict, and proper ones) there is alſo, as to ſome of the latter, a more particular, and intimate cognation,

(i) Act. 8. 17.
(k) —— 28. 8.
(l) 1 Tim. 4. 14.
(m) —— 5. 22.
(n) Annot in Conſult. Caſſand. ad Art. 9.

nation, but eſpecially as to thoſe, which are before remembred, and are by the Papiſts advanc'd into true, and proper Sacraments. For ſetting aſide that, which they call the *Sacrament of Marriage*, and which hath, even among them, rather the name, than nature of one; There is none of the other four, which tend not to the conferring of ſome Divine Grace, or Benefit, as well as to the ſignification of it. For thus *Confirmation* tends to procure a farther addition of God's ſanctifying Graces, and ſo to ſtrengthen, and perfect the perſon, that offers himſelf unto it; And thus the Oyl of *Unction*, as us'd of Old, toward the procuring of the Grace of health, and the removal of the ſick perſons guilt ſo far, as was neceſſary for the procuring of the other. Thus *Abſolution* tends to the procuring of the forgiveneſs of the Penitent, and *Ordination*, for the perſon ordain'd, of a ſpiritual, and ghoſtly Authority, if not alſo of ſuch ſpiritual gifts, as are neceſſary for the exerciſe thereof. By which means as they approach yet nearer to the nature of true, and pro-

per

per Sacraments, ſo it is the leſs to be wonder'd at, that they ſhould obtain the name of Sacraments, yea have the reputation of ſuch in a more eminent manner, than other Sacramentals had: Eſpecially if we conſider thirdly, that thoſe five ſuppoſed Sacraments are upon the matter the only noted Acts, that are adminiſtred by the Church, or, at leaſt, that are attended with ſuch Rites, and Ceremonies. For ſo it is yet leſs difficult to believe, that they might not only come by degrees to be ranked with Baptiſm, and the Lord's Supper, but together with them to be accounted, if not the only, yet at leaſt the primary ones. Which *Peter Lombard* (*o*) taking notice of, made the Number of Chriſtian Sacraments to be neither more, nor leſs than *ſeven*, and the Church of *Rome*, ſway'd by him, did afterward Authoritatively confirm. This I take to have been the true Original of that number, to which the Sacraments are now advanc'd, and not either any cogent arguments for the being of ſo many, or indeed any firm belief, even in that Church it ſelf, that

(*o*) Sentent. li. 4. Diſtinct. 2.

that they ought all to be look'd upon as true, and proper ones. And I am yet more confirm'd in that belief by the ſilence there was (*p*) before *Peter Lombard* of any certain, and determinate number, and by the Authority of two of the greateſt *Fathers* of the Latin Church : St. *Ambroſe* in his tract *de Sacramentis*, and in another *de iis qui myſteriis initiantur*, mentioning only Baptiſm, and the Lord's Supper, and St. *Auguſtine* not only reſolving (*q*) the Sacraments to be *numero pauciſſima*, and mentioning none but thoſe, but affirming elſewhere (*r*), that our Lord, and the Apoſtolical diſcipline had delivered *ſome few*; *ſuch as is the Sacrament of Baptiſm, and the celebration of Chriſt's Body, and Blood.* For that is enough to ſhew, that though the *Fathers* might ſometime mention the other Inſtitutions under the notion of Sacraments, yet they look'd upon Baptiſm, and the Lord's Supper as the only true, and proper ones, or, at leaſt, were not over confident of the being ſo of the other. If the Church of *Rome* hath ſince arriv'd at a greater confidence, it

(*p*) Conſult. Caſſandri ad Art. 13.

(*q*) Epiſt. 118. ad Januar.

(*r*) De Doctr. Chriſt. li. 3. cap. 9.

it will concern her, rather than us to give an account of it; But however not ſo far concern us, as to remove us from an opinion, which ſeems to us to be built upon ſolid, and ſubſtantial grounds. For either ſhe hath arriv'd at that confidence by the means before declar'd, and then her Authority will be very incompetent; Or ſhe hath arriv'd at it by ſome other means, which we are not acquainted with, and which therefore we cannot be ſuppos'd to be influenced by till ſhe ſhall be pleaſed to declare them.

I have inſiſted thus long upon the *Number* of the Chriſtian Sacraments, not becauſe I was obliged to it by my more immediate task (for our *Catechiſm* contents it ſelf to declare, that there are *two only as generally neceſſary to Salvation*) but becauſe our Church affirms elſewhere (*ſ*), that there are but two ſtrict, and proper ones, and becauſe the joyning of others with them in the ſame rank? and order of Sacraments may help in time to bring them into leſs repute; It being natural for men, where there are ſeveral means tending to the ſame end,

(*ſ*) Art. of Rel. 25. and Homily of Com. Pr. and Sacram.

end, either to adhere to ſome of them to the utter rejecting of the other, or to uſe thoſe others with leſs preparation, and reſpect. And whether this be not the caſe of the *Euchariſt*, where that, which they call the Sacrament of *Penance* is ſo much in vogue, may be judg'd of by the little care they take to fit themſelves for the one, where they have obtain'd, as they eaſily may, the abſolution of the other. And I ſhall only add, that if our Church did not diſtinguiſh in the preſent Catechiſm between proper, and improper Sacraments, it was not, as I conceive, becauſe ſhe had departed from her own *Articles*, and *Homilies*, but becauſe, being to inſtruct thoſe, who were no proper Auditors of higher matters, ſhe contented her ſelf to let them know, what was ſufficient for their purpoſe, that there were but *two*, *that were generally neceſſary to Salvation*, even Baptiſm and the Supper of the Lord.

Now that there are no more than theſe, that are *generally neceſſary to Salvation*, (which is all, that remains for

for me to demonſtrate) will appear if we reflect upon thoſe, which have been added to them by the Papiſts, and ranked in the ſame order with them. For who can think *Marriage* to be ſuch, who believe, as the Papiſts do, that it is unlawful to the whole Order of Prieſthood, yea who know that there are not a few, who live not long enough to deſire, or need it, or are otherwiſe ſufficiently fortified by God againſt any neceſſity of eſpouſing it? Who can believe *Orders* to be ſuch, when there ever was, and ever will be a greater number of thoſe, who are to be inſtructed, than there was, or ever will be of thoſe, who are to inſtruct them? In fine, who can believe the *Unction* of the ſick to be ſuch, when it appears by the former diſcourſe to have had no other deſign, than the recovery of them from their infirmities? For well may that be look'd upon, as not generally neceſſary to Salvation, which appears not to have been intended to miniſter at all unto it. If therefore there be any of the five of that neceſſity, it muſt be *Confirmation*, and *Abſolution*,

tion, but which how *useful* soever they may be, and are so esteemed by our selves; yet will not be found to be any more than such. I alledge as to the *former* of these the no precept there appears concerning it, which is one of those things, which induce a necessity to Salvation; And I alledge too (which is another) the no appearance there is of any tendency in it to procure some blessings, for which no other means are appointed. For the *Eucharist* having for its end the confirming and strengthning of our Graces, which is all that *Confirmation*, as now in use, professeth to intend; neither can there be any necessity of the means to oblige us to the use of the latter, or endanger our Salvation by the omission of it. In fine, I alledge, what is with me of no small moment, the no mention there is in *Justin Martyr* * of it, even where he takes notice of their bringing the New Baptized person to

Apol. 2. ἡμεῖς δὲ μετὰ τὸ οὕτως λοῦσαι τὸν πεπεισμένον, καὶ συγκατατεθειμένον ἐπὶ τοὺς λεγομένους ἀδελφοὺς ἄγομεν, ἔνθα συνηγμένοι εἰσὶ κοινὰς εὐχὰς ποιησόμενοι ὑπέρ τε ἑαυτῶν καὶ τοῦ φωτισθέντος, καὶ ἄλλων πανταχοῦ πάντων, &c.

the Aſſembly of the Faithful, and to a Communion with them in their Prayers, and Euchariſt. For though that Father doth not obſcurely intimate, that they had a particular regard in their Prayers to the welfare of the new Baptized perſon, as well as to the more general welfare of the other; Yet he takes no notice at all of any Impoſition of hands upon him, or any other ceremony, that may be ſuppoſed to be analogous to it. Which in all probability he would have done, (eſpecially when he mention'd the Kiſs of Peace, as well as both the other Sacraments) if either the Church had then us'd the Sacrament of Confirmation, or he look'd upon it as a Sacrament of the ſame general neceſſity with the other. Which things I have ſaid, not in the leaſt to detract from the uſe of Confirmation (for I think this very paſſage of *Juſtin Martyr* doth ſufficiently warrant the more material part of it, even prayer over the new Baptized perſon) but to ſhew that the Church did not then look upon it as a Sacrament, or, at leaſt, not as ſuch a one, as was generally

generally neceſſary for Salvation, as our Catechiſm hath taught us to ſpeak.

But it may be much more may be ſaid for *Abſolution*, than *Confirmation*, and ſo no doubt there may, if we conſider Abſolution as comprehending within the compaſs of it the *whole power of the Prieſt in remitting ſins*. For comprehending within it, in that ſenſe, the Adminiſtration of Baptiſm, and the Lord's Supper, becauſe the moſt effectual means the Church hath for abſolving offenders from their guilt, ſo far as thoſe Sacraments, or the Prieſts Adminiſtration of them is neceſſary to Salvation (which no doubt they generally are) ſo far alſo his Abſolution muſt be look'd upon as ſuch. But ſo to conſider Abſolution is to make it the ſame with Baptiſm, and the Lord's Supper, and not (as it is here propos'd) a diſtinct Sacrament from them. If therefore we will ſpeak pertinently either to our own *Catechiſm*, or the preſent Controverſie, we muſt conſider Abſolution as abſtracting from thoſe Sacraments; which if we do, we ſhall

find it to consist either in *declaring the word of reconciliation to Offenders*, or *praying to God for their Pardon*, or *pronouncing them absolved from their guilt*, or *loosing them from the Censures of the Church.*

If we consider *Absolution* in the first of these senses, to wit as importing *the declaration of the word of reconciliation to Offenders*; so we shall not stick to affirm, that it is generally necessary to Salvation, but then we must say withall, that it is no Sacrament, nor esteemed by the Papists themselves to be so.

If we consider it in the second sense, to wit, as denoting the Priest's *praying for the Pardon of Offenders* (and in which form, as Bishop *Usher* (t) observes, Absolution was antiently wont to be made) so it will be found to have a respect to that Community, over which he presides, or to particular persons in it. In the former of these regards it is no doubt as necessary to Salvation, as it is for the Priest to celebrate, or the people to joyn with him in the publick worship of God, of which such prayers

(t) Answ. to the Jesuits Chall. *p.* 125. *&c.*

prayers as thoſe are a neceſſary part. But as there is no preſumption of that Offices being a Sacrament, ſo it is not the Abſolution our Adverſaries intend; That, which they profeſs to advance, being the Abſolution of *particular* perſons, after a confeſſion made by them of their particular offences. And yet even here too they make a diſtinction, becauſe profeſſing to reſtrain that Confeſſion, and Abſolution to ſuch ſins only, as are mortal. But who taught them to diſtinguiſh in this affair between *Mortal*, and *Venial*? Or what is there in thoſe words of Chriſt, which convey the power of remitting ſins, which can be thought to reſtrain it to the former? What have they to ground the general neceſſity of ſuch a Confeſſion upon, but eſpecially as to that form of Abſolution, whereof we ſpeak? For in praying for the pardon of Offenders the Prieſt is not to be conſidered as a Judge, but as a perſon appointed to mediate between God, and his People, and whom that charity, which belongs to him as ſuch, will oblige him to look upon as penitent,

nitent, if he knows them not to be otherwiſe, eſpecially if they beg his prayers for their own particular pardon. And indeed neither is this the Abſolution the Papiſts contend for, nay they declare (*u*) thoſe very Prayers, which go along with their own, not to be of the Eſſence of it. Which will oblige us to paſs on to

(*u*) Conc. Trid. Seſſ. 14. cap. 3.

A *third* ſort of Abſolution, even *pronouncing offending perſons to be looſed from their offences.* A thing, which though of ſignal uſe, and comfort to men of afflicted minds, and which no doubt ſuch perſons ought to ſeek, when they cannot otherwiſe ſatisfie themſelves, yet cannot be look'd upon as generally neceſſary to Salvation; Partly, becauſe none but deſponding perſons can be ſuppoſed to ſtand in need of it, and partly becauſe ſuch an Abſolution, as that, ſuppoſeth men to be already looſed from their offences, and conſequently not to want any thing, but the ſenſe thereof. Which though it may be an infelicity, yet is no ſin in it ſelf, nor can prove ſo to him, in whom it is, unleſs it do otherwiſe take him off from

from the due performance of his duty. Though, even in that caſe, ſuch an Abſolution will be neceſſary, rather to prevent future offences, than to procure the forgiveneſs of former ones. And I ſhall only add, that I conceive that form of Abſolution to be ſuch, which occurrs in our *Viſitation of the Sick*; Partly, becauſe it is ordered by our Church to be applied to men of troubled minds, and partly becauſe it prompts the Prieſt to beg of God the forgiveneſs of the ſick perſons offences, before it allows him to ſay *I abſolve thee from all thy ſins*; That ſuppoſing the forgiveneſs of God to precede in this affair, and conſequently that the Prieſt rather declares the perſon already abſolved, than abſolves him himſelf from the band of his offences.

The *fourth* ſort of Abſolution is that, which *looſeth men from the cenſures of the Church*, and which I ſhall not ſtick to affirm to be generally neceſſary to the looſing of thoſe, who have been before bound, even from the band of their offences before God; Partly, becauſe God hath

promis'd to bind that in Heaven, which the Governours of the Church ſhall rightfully bind on Earth; And partly, becauſe the Cenſures of the Church conſiſting eſpecially in reſtraining men from its ſaving Offices, and particularly from the Sacrament of the Euchariſt, till men are looſed from thoſe Cenſures, they muſt be depriv'd of the ordinary means, whereby God hath appointed to tranſmit the pardon of offences. But as the queſtion is not, Whether Abſolution may be neceſſary in a particular caſe, or to particular perſons, but whether it be generally ſo; So we cannot look upon this Abſolution as generally neceſſary to Salvation, unleſs it were ſuch to fall under thoſe Cenſures, from which this Abſolution frees. The reſult of the Premiſes is this; The Church of God is indeed inveſted with a power of Abſolution, and ſuch, as exerts it ſelf in ſeveral Acts, anſwerably to the needs of thoſe, with whom it hath to do: But as it is not inveſted with any ſuch power of Abſolution, as doth actually free the Offender from his guilt, the doing of

that

that pertaining only unto God; As it is not therefore inveſted with any other power of Abſolution, than what may ſerve to *declare* the pardon of God, or *help toward the procuring* of it; So what it doth toward either of theſe (unleſs it be in Baptiſm, or the Lord's Supper) is either no Sacrament at all, and ſo falls not under this enquiry, or is no generally neceſſary one. And indeed, however the Church of *Rome* may ſeem to advance another Abſolution, even that which actually looſeth the ſinner from his guilt; Though ſhe moreover repreſent that Abſolution of her's, as generally neceſſary to the Salvation of thoſe who are under any mortal ſin; yet is there no appearance of any ſuch Abſolution, nor indeed of the neceſſity of any, but what is before deſcrib'd. As is evident, as to the *former* of theſe, from that very Text, on which it is founded, even a promiſe of *looſing that in Heaven, which ſhall be looſed on Earth.* For if there muſt be a looſing in Heaven, after that on Earth, that on Earth cannot be look'd upon as actually free-

ing

ing the Sinner from his guilt, but only as preparatory to it; With this only advantage (which might very well occaſion the ſo entitling it) that that looſing ſhall certainly be followed by a more effectual, and heavenly one. So little reaſon is there to believe, that there is any Abſolution among men, but what is purely preparatory to the Abſolution of God; And we ſhall find there is as as little reaſon to ſeek out any other *modes* of it, than thoſe, which were before deſcrib'd: As will appear if we conſider, who they are, that are to be looſed, and who as they are either ſuch, as are within the Communion of the Church, or ſuch as are excluded from it, ſo, if they be of the former ſort, have either done nothing to deſerve an excluſion, or have committed ſuch offences, as are worthy of it. If the perſons we ſpeak of be ſuch Members of the Church, as have not done any thing to deſerve an excluſion from it; So there cannot lye any engagement upon them to confeſs their ſins to a Prieſt, or ſeek any other Abſolution, than by

the Sacrament of the Euchariſt, or other the like ordinary methods of the Church: The Communion, in which they are, and which they have not done any thing to deprive themſelves of, giving them a title to that Sacrament, or any other priviledge of their Religion. But then if they be ſuch, as do really deſerve to be excluded, till they have given ſufficient teſtimonies of their repentance; Either they ought to be excluded, and afterwards looſed as Excommunicate perſons, or, if they be thought fit to be continued in the Church, be look'd upon as Members of it, and allowed the common Abſolutions of it: It being a kind of contradiction *in adjecto* to continue men in the Communion of the Church, and yet deny them the common priviledges thereof. All therefore, that remains to be accounted for, is the Abſolution of thoſe, who have been ſhut out of the Church; But concerning which as there is no great difference between us, and the Church of *Rome*, ſo we deny not but that it may require a peculiar *form of words*, and ſuch as may ſignifie to the

the perſons concern'd, and the Members of the Church the act of the Officers thereof in it. But that the Eſſence of Abſolution conſiſteth in it, doth not appear to us, nor can indeed be reaſonably affirm'd; Partly, becauſe the very reſtoring Excommunicated perſons to the Communion of the Church will as effectually vacate its former Cenſures, as any expreſs declaration can do; And partly, becauſe Excommunication conſiſting in a deprivation from thoſe methods of Salvation, which God hath depoſited in the Church, the only effectual releaſe of it muſt lye in a re-admiſſion to them, and particularly to the Sacrament of the Euchariſt. But ſo the Antient Church appears to have underſtood it, as is evident both from her language, and practice; She not only expreſſing this *Abſolution*, by (*w*) *bringing men to the Communion, reconciling them to it*, or *reſtoring it to them*, but taking care above all things, that no Excommunicated perſon generally ſhould go out of the World (*x*) without partaking of the Euchariſt. For what other account can be given of

(*w*) See *Uſher*'s Anſwer to the Jeſuites Challenge. *pag.* 132.

(*x*) Dionyſ. Alex. apud Euſeb. Eccl. Hiſt. li. 6. c. 44. item Conc. Nic. can. 13.

of that both language, and practice of hers, than that ſhe conceiv'd the Abſolution of Excommunicated perſons to lye in a re-admiſſion to the common methods of Salvation, and conſequently that they were rather loos'd by the uſe of thoſe methods, than by any judicial ſentence? This however is certain (which is enough for our preſent purpoſe) that Abſolution in this ſenſe cannot be look'd upon as generally neceſſary, becauſe the peculiar refuge of ſuch, as have been ſhut out of the Church. And if that be the caſe of Abſolution, as well as of the other ſuppoſed Sacraments; *Baptiſm* and the *Lord's Supper* will continue to be the *only ones*, that are of that *neceſſity* to Salvation.

FINIS.

Books lately Printed for Richard Chiſwell.

FOLIO.

DR. *Spencer de Legibus Hebræorum Ritualibus & earum Rationibus.*

Sir *James Turner*'s *Pallas Armata*, or Military Eſſays of the Ancient *Grecian*, *Roman*, and Modern Art of War.

Dr. *John Lightfoot*'s Works in *Engliſh*, in 2 Volumes, with his Life, and with large and uſeful Tables.

Mr. *Selden*'s *Janus Anglorum* Engliſhed, with Notes; To which is added his *Epinomis*, concerning the ancient Government and Laws of this Kingdom, never before extant.

Dr. *Alleſtrees* Sermons.

Dr. *Towerſon*'s Explication of the Creed, Lords Prayer, and Ten Commandments in 3 Parts.

Dr. *Cave*'s Lives of the Primitive Fathers in two Volumes.

Sir *Tho. Brown*'s Vulgar Errors, with all the reſt of his Works.

QUARTO.

PAtris Simonii *Diſquiſitiones Criticæ de Variis per diverſa Loca & Tempora Bibliorum Editionibus. Accedunt Caſtigat. Opuſc. Iſ. Voſſii de Sibyllinis Oraculis.*

Dr. *Falkner*'s Two Treatiſes of Reproaching and Cenſure: with His Anſwer to *Serjeant*'s *Surefooting*, alſo ſeveral occaſional Sermons.

The Caſe of Lay-Communion with the Church of *England* conſidered.

A Diſcourſe concerning the Celebration of Divine Service in an Unknown Tongue.

A Diſcourſe of the Neceſſity of Reformation, with reſpect to the Errors and Corruptions of the Church of *Rome*.

OCTAVO.

DR. *William Cave*'s Diſſertation concerning the Government of the Ancient Church by Biſhops, Metropolitans and Patriarchs.

Two Letters betwixt Mr. *R. Smith* and Dr. *Hen. Hammond* about Chriſts Deſcent into Hell.

Dean *Stratford*'s diſſwaſive from Revenge.

The Life of Biſhop *Bedel*.

Dr.

Books ltely Printed for Richard Chiſwell.

Dr. *Harris* his Rational Diſcourſe of Remedies.

Sir George Mackenzy's Juſt Right of Monarchy.

Defence of the Antiquity of the Royal Line of *Scotland.*

Dr. *Hez. Burton*'s firſt Volume of Diſcourſes, of *P*urity and Charity; of Repentance and of ſeeking the Kingdom of God; publiſhed by Dean *Tillotſon.*

—— His ſecond Vol. of Diſcourſes upon divers other *P*ractical *S*ubjects.

Sir Thomas More's *Utopia*, newly made Engliſh.

Biſhop *Jewels* Apology for the Church of *England*, with his Life, by a perſon of Quality.

Dr. *Towerſon* on the Sacraments. Octavo.

Dr. *Cumber*'s Companion to the Altar.

Mr. *Tanner*'s *Primordia*, or the Riſe and Growth of the firſt Church of God.

Dr. *Cumberland*'s Eſſay towards the recovery of *Jewiſh* Meaſures and Weights, comprehending their Monies; by the help of Antient Strandards compared with ours of *England.*

Biſhop *Wettenhall*'s Method and Order of private Devotion, Twelves.

Mr. *Seller*'s Devout Communicant; aſſiſted with Rules, Meditations, Prayers, and Anthems. Twelves.

FINIS.

Part, Help Printed for Richard Chiswell.

Dr. Morris his Regional Discourse of Remedies.

Sir George Mackenzie's Just Right of Monarchy.

Defence of the Anonymy of the Royal Line of Scotland.

Dr. Hey. Baker's first Volume [illegible] Charity of Reformation [illegible] Gods, [illegible] lished by [illegible]

His second Vol. of [illegible] Liver, [illegible] and Subject.

Dr. Thomas Jane's Theatre [illegible] made English.

Bishop Jewel's Apology for the Church of England, with his Lives, by a person of quality.

Dr. Jeremias on the Sacraments. Octavo.

Dr. [illegible]'s Companion to the Altar.

Mr. Turner's Primordia, or the Rise and Growth of the first Church of God.

Dr. Cambell's Essay towards the recovery of Jewish Measures and Weights, comprehending their Monies, by the help of Ancient Standards compared with our [illegible]

Bishop Wilkins's Method and Order of private Devotion, Twelves.

Mr. [illegible]'s Devout Communicant: assisted with Rules, Meditations, Prayers, and Anthems. Twelves.

FINIS.

hen I note what degree of the Equator is at the Meri-
from that degree on the Equator count $7\frac{1}{2}$ degrees to
rds, and bring thoſe $7\frac{1}{2}$ degrees to the Meridian alſo,
where the Meridian cuts the Tropick of ♋, I make a-
k, ſo ſhall $7\frac{1}{2}$ degrees of the Tropick be contained be-
e two pricks: Then I turn the Globe about till the
omes to the Horizon, and (with a quill thruſt between
an and the Ball) I faſten the Globe in this poſition:
s I move the Meridian through the notches of the
ill the ſecond prick riſes up to the Horizon, and then
degrees of the Meridian cut by the ſuperficies of the
Therefore I ſay, In the Latitude of $56\frac{1}{2}$ degrees the
y is an hour longer then it is here at *London*.

ou would know in what Latitude the Dayes are an
r, you muſt make your ſecond prick $7\frac{1}{2}$ degrees to
rds of the firſt, and after you have brought the firſt
Horizon, you muſt depreſs the Pole till the ſecond
nds to the Horizon: ſo ſhall the degree of the Meri-
Horizon ſhew in what Elevation of the Pole the days
Hour ſhorter.

Probleme may be found the alteration of Climates:
s ſaid in the Definition of Climates, *Book* 1. *fol.* 28.)
alter according to the half-hourly increaſing of the
y: therefore the Latitude of $56\frac{1}{2}$ degrees (having its
eaſed an whole hour) is diſtant from the Latitude of
y the ſpace of two Climates.

PROB. L.

*s place given, to find what alteration of Declinati-
muſt have to make the Day an Hour longer or ſhor-
And in what number of Daies it will be.*

tifie the Globe to the Latitude of the place, and bring the
s place to the Eaſt ſide the Horizon, and note againſt
gree of the Horizon it is: then bring one of the Colures
ſt the Horizon in that degree of the Horizon, and at the
interſection make a prick in the Colure; and obſerve
gree of the Equator is then at the Meridian: Then turn
Weſtwards, if the Dayes ſhorten, but Eaſtwards if

they lengthen till $7\frac{1}{2}$ degrees of the Equator pass through Meridian, and where the Horizon intersects the same Colure make another prick in the Colure: afterwards bring the ☉ to the Meridian, and count the number of degrees between two pricks, for so many degrees must the Suns Declination to lengthen or shorten the Day an Hour.

Example.

The Suns place is ♉ 10 I would know how much he alter his Declination before the Day is an hour longer here *don.* Therefore I rectifie the Globe to the Latitude of *L*, and bring ♉ 10. to the East side the Horizon, and find East $24\frac{1}{2}$ degrees fr[illegible] the East point: therefore I bring on[illegible] Colures to this $24\frac{1}{2}$ degrees, and close by the edge of the [illegible]on I make a prick with black lead, in the Colure: then ke[illegible]he Globe in this position, I look what degree of the Equato[illegible]en at the Meridian, and find 250. 15. and because the Days [illegible]n, I turn the Globe Eastwards till $7\frac{1}{2}$ degrees from the said 250. 15. pass through the Meridian: then keeping the [illegible]in this position, I make another prick in the Colure, and [illegible]ng this Colure to the Meridian, I find a little more then 5 de[illegible] of the Meridian contained between the two pricks: therefo[illegible]y, when the Sun is in ♉ 10 degrees, he must alter his Decli[illegible]n a little more then 5 degrees to make the Day an Hour lon[illegible]

Now to know in what number of dayes he shall alter De-clination, you must find the Declination of the two prick[illegible]he Colure, as you found the Suns Declination by Prob. 5. [illegible]he Arch of the Ecliptick that passes through the Meridian[illegible]le the Globe is turned from the first pricks Declination to se-cond pricks Declination, is the number of the Ecliptical [illegible]es that the Sun is to pass while he alters this Declination; [illegible]he degree of the Ecliptick then at the Meridian is (with respect to the Quarter of the Year) the place the Sun shall have [illegible]en its Declination shall be altered so much as to make the [illegible]an Hour longer.

Thus having the Suns first place given, and its seconde found; you may by finding those two places on the plain [illegible]he Horizon, also find the number of dayes comprehended [illegible]ten them, as you are taught by the fourth Probleme.